

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A-QUARTERLY-JOURNAL-OF-THE-CHRISTIAN-THOUGHT-AND-LIFE
 SET-FORTH-FROM-THE-SCRIPTURES-BY-EMANUEL-SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXV, No. 1

MAR 28 1918

JANUARY, 1918

Out of a Great Confusion; A Contribution Towards
 a Solution of the Old Testament Canon.

JACOB E. WERREN

The New Wine of the New Church.

LLOYD HASTINGS EDMISTON

The Stories of Joseph, Moses and Joshua. (The
 Word as a Whole: Second Series, VI.)

CLARENCE LATHBURY 41

The Soul of America. RICHARD KENNA CAMPBELL 49

What Knowledge Is of Most Worth?

RUSSELL EATON 59

Medical Education and the New Age.

JOHN P. SUTHERLAND 73

The Problem of Individuality. ELAINE MARSHALL 82

The Emergence of a New Idea of God. [A Review
 of H. G. Wells's "God, The Invisible King," and
 E. H. Reeman's "Do We Need a New Idea of
 God?"]

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH 99

(For Editorial Department see next page)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials:

New-Church Education and New-Church Schools.	
LEWIS F. HITE - - - - -	114
The Point of View in the Study of the Theological Works.	
WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - -	124

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies:

Material in John for the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.	
WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - -	134
The Doctrine of the Glorification in Reference to the Redemption of Society.	
EARL C. HAMILTON - - -	140

Current Literature:

C. F. Kent's "The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus." - - - - -	148
W. B. Bizzell's "The Social Teachings of the Jewish Prophets." - - - - -	153
André Chéradame's "The Pangerman Plot Unmasked."	154
H. F. Osborn's "The Origin and Evolution of Life." -	158

The New-Church Review

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. In line with its predecessor, the REVIEW aims to serve as an organ of the best thought of the New Church at large. With this aim it is to be progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, and of Mr. B. A. Whittemore and the Rev. William F. Wunsch; with the Rev. Messrs. James Reed and H. Clinton Hay in an advisory capacity.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON

50 CENTS A COPY

ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas.

\$2.00 A YEAR

(POSTAGE TO CANADA 12 CENTS, AND TO EUROPE 25 CENTS, EXTRA PER ANNUM.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXV]

JANUARY, 1918

[No. 1

OUT OF A GREAT CONFUSION—A CONTRIBUTION
TOWARDS A SOLUTION OF THE
OLD TESTAMENT CANON.

BY THE REV. JACOB E. WERREN.

THE United States of America form a country, free in many respects, but chief of all, a religious refuge since the beginning of its history. The religious freedom lies in the fact that it has no state religion. This means that no kind of religion is imposed upon any citizen. Some minds have interpreted this condition as a state of irreligion. Many have therefore thought the United States a good legitimate territory for making proselytes. But this is in reality starting from a negative assumption. For though the Constitution of the U. S. does not bind a specific form of religion upon any one, whoever reads that instrument will find that, unexpressed, it implies everywhere the great fundamental of the Christian Religion, which lies in justice and love toward the neighbor—and in this great democracy every citizen is neighbor in the full sense to every other citizen.

The question is not raised here, how far in actuality this Christian Religion finds public expression; but what concerns us at this moment is, the actual embodiment of the love of the neighbor as the fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States. This plane of the neighbor as the ever-prevailing principle of a citizen's life

is not chartered in the Constitution, but assumed because it is charter and essence of the religion founded by the Lord Jesus Christ. If anyone will in truth understand the genius of the United States of America, he will find it, if he sees it in the conscience that respects the Charter of American Liberty, which is The Word of the Lord in the Sacred Scriptures.

This is not the place to argue whether or not, or why the Sacred Scriptures are the real foundation-Charter of the Constitution that grants our liberty of life and conscience.—I have a right to posit it, and to discuss the status of this Charter of Liberty, and incidentally as claiming it the great American national principle.

What is the status of the Sacred Scriptures in these United States? The answer will probably come immediately: "Why, the same as it is the world over." And yet a closer acquaintance with American life and thought will show an essential uniqueness in the popular relation to the great literature transmitted to us from the East. It will ever be true that Europe is, as a whole, the country with leaders in thought. The breeding-places for thought emanation are its universities. In spite of its great and deservedly famous universities, America has no such hatcheries. Its universities and institutions of learning are mainly laboratories. The main body of this free country is of a deeply thoughtful and religious temperament. By "religious" is not meant a ritualistic adherence to stated formal devotions, but the increasingly strengthening adherence to principles of justice in liberty and love.

It is to these principles of justice in liberty and love that this effort at sounding the status of the Sacred Scriptures is addressed. Will your patience lend an attentive ear to a short rehearsal of history, the history of the Bible?

About twenty-two or three hundred years ago, that is, about two or three centuries before the Christian era, one of the most momentous events in the world's history was enacted at Alexandria in Egypt. It took place without clash of arms, without bloodshed. Its victorious triumph

was heralded by neither pageants nor the sound of trumpets, and yet it involved a surrender of power greater than that vested in any potentate or government. So quiet was the transfer of power from Jerusalem as one capital to Alexandria, the Athens of the world in that day, that no historian seems to have deemed it his duty or task to record the removal of this intellectual center of the universe—that is, so far as the civilization of our earth is a universe—one degree from East to West.

Having said this by way of an introduction, let me collate two points in history, about twenty-two hundred years apart. They both relate to the Jews, each presenting a critical moment. In the first, religion is challenged by philosophy—and, philosophy triumphs. In the second, science is the champion for the laurels which a resurrecting religion had not yet unconditionally surrendered to philosophy. The march indicated by these contests is the march of civilization, a progress neither definitely material, nor appreciatively spiritual, yet a migration truly natural. But let me not speak by similes, for history demands facts.

The historic points are points where the Jews touch the history of other nations. The first falls into times before the Christian era when the Bible consisted of the Old Testament only, and the event is the first translation of that Bible into Greek, an Indo-European tongue—Greek, the speech of the masterful Hellenic race. The exact date matters little; still, Homer's ashes had then been resting in mother earth at least seven hundred years. Lycurgus and Solon lived in the memory of men only. Miltiades, Alcibiades, Pericles, with a host of other personages, adorned public buildings in marble. Æschylus, Demosthenes and a race of stirring orators were studied by the living as classic models. Thales and the numerous faithful observers of physical phenomena were pointed to as "the group of early men, who opened the doors to science," while Socrates, Plato and Aristotle belonged to the "older," and "last century thinkers." Epicurus (*anno mundi* 3684=264 B. C.), with Zeno (261 B. C.), were then the modern leaders in

philosophy. And this is the manner in which the Jews came in contact with that age.

Philosophy as a wave of civilization started in the heart of Greece. In the later phases of Epicureanism and Stoicism, philosophy was particularly alive and active where Greek industry was earning its material rewards in *Magna Græcia*, in which in a certain sense the important Alexandrian colony in Egypt may be included. Here was the chief center where Epicurean and Stoic principles were discussed. The activity of this discussion overflowed into the Alexandrian Library, and filled it to an extent that, numerically, it became the collector of books worthy of its name, the great Alexandrian Library.*

The Ptolemies, active and learned rulers of Egypt—especially Ptolemy the Great—were the indefatigable compilers of that library. Under royal patronage the agitation of widely differing philosophical views unusually engaged the thinking world. Wealth and physical energy from adolescence to the full maturity of manhood were ever ready to champion Epicureanism. The activities of manhood were rightfully entitled to the enjoyment of riches and the beauties flowing as a reward from the productions of ceaseless toil.

Meditation, on the other hand, mothering the care of humanity as it prepares for independent activity in the world, learned in the midst of success to be mindful of impending misfortune, as well seeing the need of checking the multitude of ill effects arising from thoughtless and licentious over-indulgence. Thoughtfulness, with moderation, would bridle the excesses of Epicurean tendencies, and emphasize the superior power of self-control, even to the extent of supreme indifference to the emoluments of human labor.

However you may define the rival philosophies of Epicurus and Zeno, or the Schools of their followers, their

* Any one wishing first-hand information should read Josephus's account in "Jewish Antiquities," Book XII, Chap. II, which, however, must be read with care.

antipodal views as principles of life aroused even the common currents of life to stirring discussions, which were proof of the fact that philosophy was entering as a dominating factor into the practical life. It began to modify distinctly the every-day mode of the home life. Since this domestic part of life was largely a matter of religious observation with the Jews, and especially dear to them as the fixing of character from infancy up, philosophy began to be a restriction that called for some kind of a protest from the Jew as a religionist.

It was at Alexandria with a strong vigorous Jewish colony that such a protest was launched. The ground was neither an appeal to the Egyptian rulers for protection of privileges they needed for their ethnical existence, nor a denunciation of current philosophical views of life, but a protest to the ruler of a powerful nation, that not in the unrestricted enjoyment of freedom in the realm of sensuous existence, nor even in the stern power of abstemiousness from pleasures of sense, there was that fundamental element which gave to human character a perfect stability which a sound ruler might worthily seek to secure for his subjects. It was a purely intellectual controversy, though for very practical ends, and the Jews succeeded in making quite clear the positive portion of their protest, that the principles which regulated their own private life were of a much higher nature than either the tenets of Epicurus or those of Zeno. In support of their assertion they were willing to submit their sacred principles to the ruler's inspection: and the challenge was accepted. With this protest and its proffered challenge there is connected a contest and a temporary victory of the most momentous importance. The triumph was obtained not by any shedding of blood; no clash of arms in open fields set itself a monument in ruined cities or devastated fields. Perhaps this silence of the triumph, its noiseless entrance, made it possible to creep in unobserved and escape the critical search of scientific historians; at least no such recorder has found it interesting enough to report the encounter between the latest form of

Greek philosophy (about 250 B. C.) and the Jewish religious challenge of its final value in character-building.

That meeting on the intellectual arena for taking the measure of the Greek philosophy of the day and of the Jewish national customs based upon ancient tradition,—well understood, this measuring of principles was done by a sage Egyptian ruler in whose domains both Greek and Jew had a very hospitable reception, and who apparently as a measure of sage statesmanship explored everything that was found a nation-building help, that he might strengthen his wise rule,—that meeting on Egyptian ground for the measuring of philosophy and religion as national powers in the hands of a ruler did not take place without leaving accomplished facts as witnesses to the conquest, and even as the trophies of the resultant victory. Record and monument are both one, and can be read in the venerable work called the *Septuaginta*.

When we are told the *Septuaginta* is the Greek version of the Old Testament made about 250 B. C. at Alexandria, we have apparently a very simple statement of fact. That "simple fact" gains stupendously, when we see it in its *setting*, which is, in reality, the protest of the Jewish religion against the Hellenistic philosophy (Epicureanism and Stoicism) of the day, before the Egyptian court as a gatherer of records in the forum of the Alexandrian Library. Except for this court, the court of permanent record for physical phenomena, we might never have known of this battle waged by philosophy against religion. The battle has become visible because the court had adopted the new language of philosophy which did not understand the language of religion, and asked of religion to present its case in the language of philosophy. In plain English, Alexandria was completely Hellenized, and needed to have the Jewish protest expressed in Greek, because Hebrew had become a dead tongue in Egypt, since the Israelites had fled from that country twelve centuries ago in order to cast off the Pharaonic yoke.

It is interesting that in this (then so very *modern*) con-

test the Jews submitted as their evidence their *whole* literature in testimony against the then hodiernal philosophy. We must however be willing to go in spirit back to that age, to understand its question, otherwise we shall become entangled (as so many before us have done) in an interminable snare. There is a most significant fact we meet at the outset, that has given rise to many questions, and the underlying difficulty we might just as well meet at once. It lies here: The Jews, as stated above, submitted their *whole* literature as evidence for something in their religion which they deemed superior to anything in the latest phases of philosophy, whether Epicurean, or Stoic. When the evidence comes forth it appears wholly transformed in the Greek *Septuaginta*, with the Jewish religious standpoint changed.

A discussion of this great work, the *Septuaginta* or Greek Version of the Old Testament, would be properly in place here, but the consideration of the myths and facts of its origin, the peculiarity of its language, its character in the translation, with a glimpse upon the translators themselves, as well as the tendencies philosophically and religiously displayed therein would be foreign to us, at least too ponderous for our present purpose; or to speak perhaps more worthily of those who may be interested in this subject, the *Septuaginta* has been so frequently and extensively submitted to scrutiny that the problems presented within it may be assumed as known.

One of the chief perplexities presented by the *Septuaginta* needs to be singled out for our purpose: it is the very different order in which the Jewish collection of books is presented in the *Septuaginta*, and precisely this difficulty we must now meet. What is the order of the books in the *Septuaginta*? And what is the Jewish order of those books? This presents the perplexing question of theologians commonly known as the *Canon* of the Sacred Scriptures. We mean to stay clear of theological quibbles by, first of all, avoiding its technicalities. It will also not be necessary to be delayed by many questions of detail.

The order of the books in the *Septuaginta* is reasonably familiar to us all, because the order of the books as it appears in our Bibles is practically the same as that in the *Septuaginta*. As a matter of fact the order of the books as it appears in the Greek version, made about 250 B. C., was adopted by the Latin translators and Jerome, about 400 A. D., i.e., about seven centuries later, and is in use to this day in the Roman Catholic Church. This most excellent and careful Latin version has been followed by all Protestant versions and is found in all the modern languages into which the Bible has been translated. Probably most of you can readily name the thirty-nine books making the Old Testament from Genesis to Malachi.

It is because the Jewish order of books is so different that we must set out at once to become familiar with it. First of all, we need to consider that the Jews had two essentially different collections: one was their sacred series of books, the other contained writings of their fathers or what we now call a "patristic literature." These two sets of writings have been kept conscientiously apart by the Jews to this day. The latter they call the *Kethubim* (which simply means "writings"). Let us keep in mind that the Jews never mingled these writings with those that were sacred.

The Sacred Writings of the Jews were for their official purposes always preserved in three great rolls or volumes (for their leaves were not folded and turned, but joined in a continuous strip and rolled). The first great roll in its official script measures about seven hundred and fifty feet of sheepskin. The other two were of very nearly the same size. As only few can see these rolls as used still in Jewish synagogues, let me translate the terms into more intelligible language by taking names and numbers from the modern printed Hebrew Bible, for even there the old order of the books and their names are still preserved, because the Old Testament in Hebrew is still the Jewish contribution to us, the first editions having been set

in type and printed in Italy by the most learned Jews of the day.

The first roll contains the *Torah* or the Law. It is a book of three hundred and fifty pages in print. We know it more familiarly as The Five Books of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. But the Jews never call them five books; if they use any other name than the *Torah*, they call it "the five-fifths of the Law." This is the first division of their Sacred Books.

The second roll contains the first section of the great series called the Prophets. It is called in the Hebrew Bible the former Prophets, and occupies three hundred and ten pages in print. We must notice this name particularly, because we are not accustomed to think of its "books," Joshua, Judges, Samuel (first and second), and Kings (first and second), as containing anything like prophecy. We read them as "history"—to the Jews they still are "prophecy."

The third roll is the continuation of the prophetic series, and has in the Hebrew Bible the name the later Prophets. It is a volume of three hundred and thirty printed pages, and contains what we have been accustomed to call "the prophets," viz., the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah with Lamentations, Ezekiel, generally designated the "great Prophets"; and the twelve (or "minor") prophets, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.

These three rolls were kept by themselves in a sacred receptacle, the tabernacle, which was called "the Lord's Sanctuary," also "Jehovah There."

The patristic writings, entitled by them the *Kethubim*, were always kept separate and distinct from the Sacred Books. They were never kept in any particular collective roll or rolls, and were regarded as distinctly human compositions or literary contributions. Here is a list of the treatises collected in *Kethubim*: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles (first and second).

In this collection we find therefore, first of all, the Psalms, the Jewish hymnbook. Then, an ancient lyric, possibly the world's first drama, Job. Next to these treasures are placed the productions of the Psalmists' great successor, Solomon, to whom one or all of Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes are ascribed. Ruth and Esther are epics in the form of historical monographs. Ezra and Nehemiah are historical episodes, or rays of sunshine in the final eclipse of the Jewish church in Captivity. By modern historians and critics these two little works are so unduly exaggerated in importance that these "critics" absolutely distort the perspective of this portion of Jewish history. The last work, Chronicles, is clearly another imitative work, intended to complete, or at least complement and carry further, the later historical records of Second Kings.

The order of the *Septuaginta* departs from the order of the Jewish Books, and essentially disregards the Jewish distinction of "Sacred Books" and "Patristic Writings." Without entering critical minutiae as to variations and additions, the order is practically the same as found in our Bibles. For comparison we give the two orders, the Jewish and the *Septuaginta*, in two lists,—the first with items consecutively numbered, and the second with items retaining the same numbering, and thus clearly showing the extent of the rearrangement:

THE JEWISH ORDER

Roll I.—(1) The Torah, or the Law: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy

Roll II.—Former Prophets: (2) Joshua, (3) Judges, (4) Samuel I & II, (5) Kings I & II

Roll III.—Later Prophets:

(a) major: (6) Isaiah, (7) Jeremiah (including Lamentations), (8) Ezekiel

(b) minor: (9) Hosea to Malachi

Patristic Writings.—(10) Psalms, (11) Proverbs, (12) Job, (13) Song of Solomon, (14) Ruth, (15) Ecclesiastes, (16) Esther, (17) Daniel, (18) Ezra-Neemiah, (19) Chronicles I and II

THE *Septuaginta* ORDER

(1) The Five Books of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy

Historical Books: (2) Joshua, (3) Judges, (14) Ruth, (4) Samuel I & II, (5) Kings I & II, (19) Chronicles I & II, (18) Ezra-Neemiah, (16) Esther, (12) Job.

Poetical Books: (10) Psalms, (11) Proverbs, (15) Ecclesiastes, (13) Song of Solomon

Prophetical Books:

(a) major: (6) Isaiah, (7) Jeremiah (including Lamentations), (8) Ezekiel, (17) Daniel

(b) minor: (9) Hosea to Malachi

The change which the Greek translators introduced into the old Hebrew order is clear; it consists in sandwiching the patristic literature in between the books of the Sacred Order. We naturally ask the reason for this. One answer is evidently that which our translators have given: that the orderly mind of the Greek scholars, from a closer scrutiny of all the books, perceived clearly that certain books were distinctly historical, and these they arranged in a chronological order; other books were plainly poetical, and these too were arranged in chronological series; and all the books found in the Jewish collection were rigidly made to follow the historical order, evidently because both history and poetry were recognized as well-established mental categories. The last class of literary distinction, the prophetic books, had no parallel in the Greek learned world, and was serenely put at the end.

This answer has always seemed sufficient; but a little closer thinking shows that it satisfies only one side of the

question, Why the Jewish and the *Septuaginta* order of the Old Testament books differ. It satisfies the inquiry as to what is the basis of the *Septuaginta* order; but it leaves out any answer to the question. Is there anything in the Jewish order of the books, that accounts for the distinction of "holy books" and the "patristic writings," besides explaining their arrangement?

There is no doubt the Greeks did ask the Jews, What was their reason for having two sets of books? It seems, they did get an answer of some sort, which is embodied in the title that the Greeks gave as the meaning and translation of the Hebrew word *Kethubim*. That word is simply an equivalent for our word "writings"; but the Hebrews impressed the Greeks that all the writings that were passed into their hands were very important, and so very sacred to them. The Greeks received the filial and pious information, and recorded it in the Hebrew copy of the *Kethubim* by placing beside the Hebrew heading the memorandum *Hagiographa*, i.e., "holy writings." It meant no more than this: that, to the Jews, these were "sacred writings."

This, as their tradition, was all the esoteric information the Jews had to give to the Ptolemaic age as to how the set of historical and prophetic books (otherwise known as "the Law and the Prophets") in their keeping differed in holiness from the books of their making, i.e., from "the *Kethubim*"). In turning out therefore the final translation of all the Hebrew books that were especially dear to Jewish tradition, the Greeks saw from their philosophical standpoint no reason why the whole collection should not be submitted to one rational classification. What they had received from the Jews was to the Greeks a collection in an unordered condition: the Greeks therefore present their order in the *Septuaginta*.

The reasoning of the translators embodies a most careful scrutiny of the Jewish "tradition." It is evidently more than the judgment of the Alexandrian Greeks, for six or seven hundred years later Jerome and his complement of endorsing papal consistory accepted completely the ultimate

arrangement of the books that now constitute the Old Testament of the Bible. It finally received the full papal sanction in the Latin translation where it is known as the *Vulgate*, the official and only fully "authorised" translation of the Hebrew collection of books.

Nor did the adoption of the Greek order of the Hebrew sacred books see its limits here, for all the leaders of the Reformation and the subsequent sects of Protestantism have with one accord followed in the footsteps of the *Septuaginta*: they accepted without any dissent the verdict of philosophy, which is, that Jewish tradition making a distinction between "the Law and the Prophets" on the one hand, and on the other the *Kethubim*, or "writings of the Fathers," offers no valid basis for classifying their books, and that the chronological arrangement observed in the literary classes (of history, poetry and prophecy) is the only rational ground for their evaluation.

It is the whole Indo-European race, or language-element, which thus proclaims in fact the verdict of philosophy versus the tradition with which coheres the Jewish religion: thus triumphed philosophy over religion.

This is the fuller view of the first historic point under consideration, the meaning of the conflict of philosophy and religion, and the status of the Old Testament since its entrance into the Indo-European world. But not only is there an East that is in certain lines "unalterable"—yea, we have the unalterable East in our midst, and the most memorable event, the contact of the Bible with the Occident, is paralleled by another memorable occurrence in our day, the Jews making their own first important translation of those "Sacred Books" into English.* English is the most essential language of modern Indo-European civilization. In that garb the Jews are bringing the old order of their tradition to our doors with the expressed wish that the Christians, the Indo-European world, would take notice! That they insist on making, or at least choos-

*See my review of this translation in the *New-Church Review* of July, 1917, pp. 459-463.

ing their own translation, one can readily understand, because they are primarily making a version for those of their race who have chosen to become free citizens in America, their new world. The great point they insist on is, not that of being Jews upon the basis of this book; no, the point they insist on is, that this book shall be preserved, at least among them, in the old order, the one which the Old Testament has always had to this day in the Hebrew Bible. They speak in this to every scholar in every corner of the civilized globe.

Translating the situation into plain speech this Jewish version with its old order of the books squarely challenges in our day the philosophical order of the books in the Old Testament as held throughout the Christian world. To be sure, there will be no blood shed on battlefields over this question, but plainly the Christian Church will have to take up their silent challenge and to give some answer to thoughtful minds within their own churches, persons who have a right to ask for the reason. Nor will it be sufficient to answer them with the old formula: "The Church has settled that question long ago, the Canon has been determined, and our Bibles are the answer with the proof." If there were but one single person in a church (and the church were better quite mindful that within her folds the questioners are today a large and increasing host) asking for a rational answer and not for mere asserted authority,—I say, if there were but one sincere sheep in a flock asking the question, "Why do the Jews insist on a separate order for the books of the same Bible that we have," the pastors, priests, teachers and leaders owe it to the sheep to lead and guide them in the light to the light. More than this, the church and her leaders have been neglectful in not acquainting their flocks with the facts long, long ago, that there is a controversy over the order of books: for only knowing the facts can there be a foundation to finding a solution where differences exist.

Here we are then meeting the same question which thoughtful philosophers asked twenty-two hundred years

ago. There are very many with a mystic faith in our churches, very honest people, who think the Jews have somehow a superiority of knowledge that should be reachable. They feel there is hidden with the Jews a knowledge that we need, if we only knew how to get it from them. That feeling is old; it is part of a sacred mystery surrounding that old, old book, the Old Testament. Down through the ages the Jews themselves have been filled with the feeling that there is something very deeply significant in their "holy books." They have endeavored in many ways to get at that hidden, deep, most valuable meaning. But neither Cabala nor Talmud contributed anything of value to the world's better and greater knowledge in that effort.

Let the whole world be sure of one thing: they have given to the world the most valuable thing they had to give—the Jews have given to the world their sacred literature, and now it is "up to the world" to use its best thinking power to meet the challenge of their tradition. If it were a question of making proselytes to the Jewish religion, their collateral literature would be of immense use—but their ancient books have become the common property of Semites and Christians, and the modern question linking Jew and Christian with the Old Testament, is first of all the relation of that book to modern civilization, and that great factor is eminently the external result of Christianity. It is because the Old Testament question is more than a mere theological, or purely academic, subject that the man in the street will want to know, not merely what the contention of Jew and Christian in regard to this mere external order of the Old Testament books is, but a reasonable answer as to what this difference means, and some clear help to bridge over the difficulties among people who upon a common basis should have a kindly common thought.

Thinking humanity is tired of the edicts by church authority which binds reason without enlightening it. It is tired, too, of mere custom which goes on holding tenaciously to what "our fathers told us." Reason is rattling the doors on corroding hinges: the lock is rusty; will the inner

chamber be empty when criticism, that rasp and file of mere Reason, shall feel resistance give way to the last, energetic efforts of its confidence to success? Will the challenge of old Jewish tradition succumb to scientific reason today as it seemingly had to yield twenty-two centuries ago to the philosophy of the day?

If there is any reason underlying the old Jewish order of books, an order which carefully kept apart a sacred literature from a patristic literature, or a sacred from a profane literature, then philosophy succeeded in creating a thoroughgoing confusion of what is sacred and profane, and Christianity itself stands by and upon that confusion. Will the Jews of today succeed in charging such confusion upon Christianity? or will Jewish protest receive its final answer by being— simply ignored?

Biblical criticism has anew submitted that ancient literature to a most searching examination. It has succeeded in adding to the philosophical a literary confusion which seems thoroughly baffling to a mind that would grasp not only this latest, but also the earlier difficulties connected with this Guide-Star of the world's civilized progress. The tearing into shreds of something that clearly is a literature in the eyes of any reading intelligence, is absolutely impotent, so long as it does not answer other difficulties. From philosophy to "higher criticism," nothing that has been done in the Christian world has met the Jewish demands, or refuted their claims successfully. The question has been dealt with only onesidedly, and therefore superficially. It is a foolish mind that can live contentedly alone within its own little circle of thought; the rational man lives wisely for the world. In this broad view the Jewish challenge of our day should be met. Can it be met to answer both the old Jewish and every Christian difficulty connected with that order of the books in the Old Testament? It is certain that none of the current or abandoned theories can be continued before a rational forum, and the confusion of ancient books in the Bible with the perennial Jewish protest must be solved upon the basis of an entirely

new theory. In quest of this new theory should we not be mindful of the old saying:

“The Stone which the builders refused,
the same is become the Head of the corner”?

In other words, in taking up a new perspective of the Bible, why not let the Leader of Christianity have a word to say? Should He not be deemed worthy to be taken into our confidence? I am aware that Christian students, both philosophers and critics, have pronounced against taking Jesus seriously in what He says about the Bible. They have generally held the critical questions in discussion as too recent to come actually under His notice and observation. So no one has found it worth his while to examine the sayings of Jesus on the subject. Let such questions as to whether He was a philosopher, a critic in our sense, or a historian, be laid aside, and remember that His mother was a Jewess, and the people among whom He was born were the Jews. Of course, we are aware that Jesus is not *persona grata* with the Jews. Not esteemed for the purpose among Christians, neither acceptable to the Jews, there is at least the prospect of having in Jesus an impartial witness. As it is not a theologian, Jew or Christian, but just an ordinary man who wants to know, Jesus may be heard, even gladly, because the critics on both sides have discarded Him.

As this is not intended to be an exhaustive treatise, a few quotations may show us His standpoint, at least. Here it is needful to remember that in His day the New Testament was not extant. The Old Testament for official purposes was used in Hebrew script and roll. For ordinary reading purposes the Greek translation in the *Septuaginta* was used.

In His teaching, Jesus repeatedly refers to “the Law and the Prophets.” This is not a “vague” denomination, but a distinct endorsement of the ancient Sacred Books. “The Law” is not infrequently called simply “Moses,” as what had been written by Moses. “The Prophets” em-

brace the two series, the "former" and the "later." The "Law and the Prophets" were the three sacred rolls.

Jesus enlarges this series of sacred books by referring to two books as equal in importance with these; they are books contained in the patristic collection, viz., the Psalms, and Daniel, which are both ranked by Him as Prophecy.

Not one of the other "writings" of the fathers is ever mentioned or alluded to by Him.

It may be a vague cabalistic fancy; nevertheless, the Jews remember here that their fathers have long held that their sacred books were as many as there were letters in the Hebrew alphabet, namely, twenty-two—but they never succeeded in finding that number. Let them take Jesus' enumeration—remembering that "the Law" ever counted as one book, never as five, i.e., five-fifths of the Law"—and you find the following:

First roll,—Moses, or five-fifths of the Law	1 book
Second roll,—Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings—	4 books
Third roll,—major Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel	3 books
minor Prophets: Hosea to Malachi	12 books
The Lord's expansion,—Psalms, and Daniel	2 books
A sum total of	22 books*

There is a secret, as well as sacred reason, why there are as many books in the sacred collection as there were letters in the Hebrew alphabet—perhaps, with some more patient enquiry, that will become patent which they with their fathers have mystically believed. What Secret is there in the number of letters and of the Hebrew alphabet, that such details should have any relation to the number of the sacred books of the Hebrew Bible, our Old Testament?

* This leaves still a future examination of the whole series of books in the light of the Jewish claim, that they conceal a progressive "sanctity as authority" in their true order.

But should not the Christians be reminded, that Christianity with the Bible as its charter from its inception has rested upon a philosophical confusion which has mingled sacred and profane books of antiquity into a symposium that has ever been a stubborn bone of contention? To its final solution "Modernism" and "Higher Criticism" hoped to contribute the ultimate of rational ground, that nothing could possibly set again aside. They have added to the confusion, but of solution they offered no trace. Why should not Christians be willing to take the dictum of Jesus Christ as a clue, even as a mere working theory? It is not too much to hold that with all the acute and profound thinking which has characterized the pursuit of Astruc's clue, there may be more profoundly astounding results in waiting than have once fired the hopes of the assiduous critics, if they follow the clue started by Jesus.

With Jesus in a Christian's confidence for the first time in two thousand years is the answer given to the question, Where and what is the Word of God?

For the collection extant in His day (the Old Testament) He answers distinctly and clearly. The Word of God is all of The Law and the Prophets, the Psalms, and Daniel. This is His catalog, so definite that none can misunderstand.

But Jesus does not merely enumerate the classes of books constituting the Scripture; He undertakes the much more difficult task of furnishing the principle upon which the genuineness of the sacred books can be ascertained and determined. This principle He enunciated to the Jews as He was teaching them on the Sabbath Day of a great feast: "Search the Scriptures . . . for it is they that testify of Me" (John 5:39). This principle it is that He endeavored to impress upon His disciples, when, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke 24:27).

The disciples, the Lord's first followers, clearly caught the Master's idea as relating to one theme, the resurrection, even if they most imperfectly comprehended how that theme in Jesus' case was connected with the Scripture, at least the

one which Jesus brought forth as teaching the momentous fact of man's rising after death:

Now that the dead are raised even Moses showed at the bush, when he called God the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob: He is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for unto Him all live.

We may marvel at the theme—for who would ever have thought of preaching on the resurrection from the text, "Moses at the bush"? But surely the disciples took their clue to the resurrection of Jesus not from this passage, but rather from the fact of their experience, that they saw Him risen. The verification of the resurrection based upon the narrative in Moses has yet to be made, but will be possible only when Jesus' own method of interpretation becomes known from a systematic investigation of His method, and an observation of His application. This is a task yet in the future; it is entirely novel, and apparently not without great difficulty. It does not even seem inviting to those most qualified for the work, I mean scholars, men of learning, because they point to the questionable success which the accredited teachers in that line, I mean "the ministers of the Gospel," have achieved. Whatever that "success" may appear to be, so much is sure: they have not had any really definite principle according to which to proceed. Every denomination, whether Catholic or Protestant, has hitherto had, so to speak, a special kind of spectacles to use for its enquiry, whether it was a set, or mere individuals of specialists, who had ground the lenses for them. Even the school of Higher Critics is no exception to the spectacled army: however independent they imagine themselves to be, observers who follow their trail soon discover the trade-mark of Astruc on their lenses.

Let an earnest student strike out boldly to apply Jesus' principle to a new field. We may grant at the outset it is not so easy to do it in the remote field of the Old Testament. The rational way is, to begin to apply a new principle first where it is easy of application. Where is that principle, "The Scriptures . . . testify of Me (Jesus)," most

easily applied? Why most assuredly to the books of the New Testament. These lie before us in a series of four classes :

- 1—the four Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John
- 2—the book of the Acts of the Apostles
- 3—the Pauline and the General Epistles
- 4—the book of Revelation.

Observing their contents—and from these alone our decision is to be made if we would have original testimony—the Gospels are plainly and evidently “Scriptures that testify of Jesus,” and that entirely independently of the authors who report the events. Not only are the names of the Gospels by which we designate them no part of the gospels, but it would not alter the character of the contents, if it could be proved that they are in the handwriting of Bacon, or Macaulay; the contents “testify *in toto* of Jesus,” and as such testimony have their value as Sacred Scriptures. In other words, Jesus declares, so far as the books of the Bible are concerned, it is not the scribe who communicates to them any holiness, but Jesus, the whole Subject of the Scriptures. According to His principles then, the four Gospels are Sacred Scriptures. It may be equally clear that however obscure it may seem to most readers, the Book of Revelation is of the same order, because it is “The Revelation of Jesus which God gave.”

But how about the “Acts of the Apostles”? Is it not perfectly clear what they testify of? This book very distinctly declares that its object is not primarily to report what Jesus said and did, but what the Apostles did in establishing the Christian Church. It is not degrading this book to say, that according to Jesus’ test it is not Sacred Scripture; it is merely applying the Lord’s criterion in distinguishing this interesting primitive Church history from Sacred Scripture. Is it sacrilegious to abandon mystic tradition when applying Jesus’ criterion? Or dare we take Him into our confidence and trust ourselves to a freer interpretation?

Again, turning to the "Epistles," are they not the strengthening voice of good pastors, who encourage and lead their flocks? What more are they, than another field of literature showing a phase of the early life in the Christian Church? It is not the testimony of Jesus, His life, His teaching, His deeds that the epistles aim at; it is the strengthening of particular churches in doctrine and life by the help and wisdom of a brother that they aim at. So again, it is no minifying of their importance, when according to Jesus' criterion the Epistles are not Sacred Scripture; it is simply applying His distinction, permitting men to study freely the phase of church life which these "letters" depict.

The point is perfectly simple, our "New Testament" like the Old, is a composite structure in which the Word of God is mingled with writings of the fathers. Shall we dare follow His example in making the distinction which Jesus made in holding the sacred books apart from profane books?

Let us remember that, as Students who are following a new clue, we are not casting a slur upon any book or person. We are confirming nothing; we are denying nothing. We are simply following the suggestion of a new Leader in order to see what the new principle may point to. When we grasp the meaning of the new point, it will then be time to decide, whether our judgment bids us accept or reject the same. But at all events our judgment will not be based upon hearsay, prejudice, or imagination, but upon facts, and have the advantage of appearing to us rational proof. Are we not bidden "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." This then is our initial stand with Jesus' principle as our guide: To the Jew who at this day confronts us with the old order of sacred and patristic literature we say,

Your Sacred books are lacking the Psalms and Daniel, for the Rabbi Jesus declared it so; with the patristic literature we find no fault, nor would we exclude from it the books which throw any light upon ancient and modern interpretation.

Interpretation, the application of a principle to any book or set of books, is a further process, at present beyond our aim; but to it Targum, Talmud, and even Cabala, are welcome helps. So long as you have no clear principle upon which to base your order in the collection of your books, we invite you, Jews, to join our expedition into the domain of an unexplored territory.

To the Christians of old and modern, even most modern, standing we would say:

The hostile division in which your camps have for nearly two thousand years arrayed themselves are the result of philosophical and scientific standpoints which have permitted the ancient books of the Church to become a hopeless confusion, out of which even the most modern learning has been unable to extricate them. Come, join a new caravan. Determined to give up nothing that can aid sound reason, yet ready to drop whatever may be hostile to this new class, be willing to try a most daring, yet in one sense the most Christian experiment that has ever been tried.

Probably no New-Churchman has anything against this clearing up of "the great confusion" by the Lord Himself. Possibly, he might say, "You might have arrived at that conclusion much more quickly," quoting A. C. 10325:

Books of the *Word* are all those which have internal sense; those that do not have it are not the Word. The books of the Word in the Old Testament are five books of Moses, the book of Joshua, the book of Judges, both books of Samuel, both books of Kings, the Psalms of David, the Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

True, I should have got at these more speedily, but only because Swedenborg says "these books have an internal sense." To accept this saying, is to accept a revered authority—but it is an authority not from within. Does Swedenborg lose anything by our finding him in agreement with Jesus? And is not Jesus an authority to which "every knee may bow" even if they do not know Swedenborg?

Moreover the authority of Jesus carries with it something most interesting to a New-Churchman: Jesus, the

Savior, the God-Man, is Himself the inmost of the internal sense—and Swedenborg in declaring “Books of the Word are all those which have an internal sense” is only transcribing the words, that the Scriptures “testify of Me”; and when He is seen in them, then is fulfilled the Psalmist’s prophecy “Lo, I come in the volume of the Book written of Me”; and out of the great confusion comes the center of the Christian world, Jesus, the Savior, who says: “I am the Light of the World: he that followeth after Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the Light of life.”

In conclusion, Is not this country where Christians and Jews most freely mingle, and where the fruits of the freest civilization are unstintedly the privilege of every toiling hand,—is not this American democratic state, where no man need be hampered by any school or supreme authority, the land in which to strike out with a new working hypothesis which, perchance, may open a wider meeting ground upon which with a more kindly interpretation, there may develop a truer regard for humanity to which Jew and Christian may be alike factors contributing to a mutual love of well doing?

JACOB E. WERREN.

THE NEW WINE OF THE NEW CHURCH.

BY REV. LLOYD HASTINGS EDMISTON.

HAS fermented wine a higher significance than the sweet juice that the Lord has ripened in the grape? Our interpretation of doctrine relative to several important natural problems depends upon the answer we give to this question. If alcoholic wine as a beverage has the higher significance, as is commonly asserted by our students, it is difficult to avoid the inference that the higher symbolism is based upon a superior purity and value as an article of diet. Such a conclusion, in effect, makes the doctrines of the church a defense of the use of alcoholic liquor, and if logically followed out, would, it seems to us, line up the church with the defenders of the liquor traffic. It at least puts the church out of line with the great and ever-growing world movement that seeks to protect the young, the weak and the ignorant from the enslaving snare of alcoholic drink.

This anti-alcohol movement has originated since the last judgment, and there are many New-Church people who believe it to be a New Age movement, and bound to triumph. They view the moral enthusiasm of this crusade as a part of that leafing out of the fig tree of natural good from a heavenly origin, which is one of the signs given of the Lord's coming. With an increasing number of such New-Churchmen, the feeling grows that some mistake has been made. They are asking the question: "Have our New-Church students of the wine question, in their almost unanimous conclusions favorable to fermented wine, grasped the whole truth?" Personally, we have long felt that in these interpretations of the doctrines on this question they have but emphasized a misleading half-truth, from which socially harmful deductions are almost inevitable.

I am aware that the broad and kindly scholarship of the church, after the fullest investigation, has rejected the historical and doctrinal conclusions of the late Dr. John Ellis. They have found no adequate evidence to substantiate his claim that a preserved and unfermented wine was in common use among the Jews in Bible times. They have therefore rejected his supposition that when, in the Bible and in the doctrines, the word "wine" is used in a favorable way the unfermented juice is what is meant; and that when the word is used in an evil sense, the leavened and fermented form is the substance to which reference is made. Our scholars have found the historical evidence demonstrating, beyond a reasonable doubt, that, apart from the fresh juice, fermented wine was the only wine with which the Jews were familiar, and that it was this form of wine that they used in the Passover feasts. From this it follows that fermented wine is what is meant wherever the word for ordinary wine is used in the original languages of the Bible. Although the Savior used a figure of speech for wine in inaugurating the Holy Supper, still in all probability he used the customary alcoholic beverage. The writings furnish no evidence that Swedenborg knew of any preserved form of unfermented wine. Though he occasionally uses the Latin word for "wine" in reference to what is obviously the unfermented juice, still in practically all places where he uses the word he is beyond question thinking of ordinary fermented wine.

Now, in admitting all this, it may seem that we are accepting in their entirety the conclusions, favorable to fermented wine, that are common among our New-Church ministers and scholars; but this is far from being the case. We will at once hint at least at our position. If the Savior used fermented wine in the inauguration of the Holy Supper in the First Christian Church, there may be a special reason for its use then, in connection with the inauguration of the Primitive Church, that does not apply in determining the sacramental wine to be used in His newly inaugurated New Church.

As we have already stated, most of our students of the wine question have understood Swedenborg to teach definitely that, from the standpoint of food values and human utility, fermented wine is the purified and perfected product. From this, they have concluded that the alcoholic product has a discretely higher significance. This wide-spread thought within the church is based upon what we believe to be a misinterpretation of certain isolated passages, in the doctrines, relative to the cleansing and clarifying effect of fermentation. We call them isolated references because, as used to establish the especial goodness of alcoholic wine, they are made to teach a lesson different from the general teachings of the writings in regard to the quality and significance of that which is leavened and fermented. It has been almost inevitable that an extreme meaning should be read into those references because they are thus made to provide a much needed natural explanation, both for the good significance frequently given to fermented wine and also for the probable use by the Savior Himself of that kind of wine in the Holy Supper. But if there is an adequate explanation of the good significance of fermented wine, and of its use, by the Lord, that is not based upon the premises that alcoholic wine is purer than the juice as it is in the ripened grape, then their interpretation loses its force and motive.

Let us briefly review the main passages from the Doctrines, that have been used to confirm the superiority of fermented wine and things alcoholic. In "Conjugal Love," n. 145 (2) we read: "This spiritual purification may be compared with the purification of natural spirits . . . and the purified wisdom may be compared with alcohol, which is spirit most highly rectified." In "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 7906 (2), we read: "It is to be known that the purification of truth from falsity with men is impossible without fermentations—*so called*. That is, without the combat of falsity with truth. . . . But after the combat . . . and the truth has conquered, the falsity falls down like lees, and the truth comes forth purified: like wine, which, after fermentation,

becomes clear." In "Divine Providence," n. 25, we find: "For there are evils and falsities together that do a work, when introduced into societies, like that of leaven put into meal, or ferments into new wine, by which heterogeneous things are separated and homogenous things are conjoined and purity and clearness are the result." In "Divine Providence," n. 284, after a similar description of spiritual fermentations, we read: "If good, then, conquers, . . . the good is like wine that becomes generous after fermentation, or liquor that becomes clear. If evil conquers, good with its truth is removed to the sides and becomes turbid and offensive (sometimes translated 'foul') like unfermented wine or liquor."

Now, in these comparisons and illustrations, Swedenborg makes perfectly plain the spiritual truth he is seeking to convey; but we are going beyond his evident thought when we assume that in these passages he is intending to indorse distilled spirits as a drink, or alcoholic wine as a perfected and superior food product. The aggressive defenders of fermented wine place a supreme emphasis on these passages, assuming that they prove that it is the fermenting process that makes the "fruit of the vine" at all worthy to serve in the Holy Supper. Yet in these passages Swedenborg is not discussing the especial fitness of fermented wine for sacramental purposes. In all the many passages where the symbolism of the elements is directly dwelt upon, he never refers to the fermenting process.

If it were true that a clarified and sterilized sweet juice is "foul" and "offensive," requiring to be first worked over by the bacteria of fermentation before it is fit for human use, then indeed we would have to assume that alcoholic wine would possess the higher signification. It seems obvious that in the passages quoted, Swedenborg is not speaking either of purity or of foulness from any such human use standpoint. The purifying of which he speaks is the obvious or visible transformation of the raw and contaminated must from its crude turbidness to the transparent clearness that results from fermentation. If his intended

meaning is limited to this purity of visible clearness, the question of the relative quality and goodness of the pure juice of the grape, as compared with alcoholic wine, is left untouched.

Now, before any one confirms the thought, from these passages, that fermenting perfects the food values of a pure grape juice, he should pause and note that in some of the comparisons Swedenborg gives we have references to the clarifying of strong drink, and the purifying of distilled alcohol. Was he intending, by the authority of his enlightenment, to establish the physical dogma that these particular alcoholic liquors are perfected food products? From his memorial to the "Swedish Diet" of November 17th, 1760, we may safely answer in the negative, as far, at least, as distilled liquors are concerned. We read: "If the distilling of whisky . . . cannot be done away with altogether, which would be more desirable for the country's welfare and morality than all the income which could be realized from so pernicious a drink."

Let us now turn to another line of evidence. Our knowledge from the Writings of the action and symbolism of leaven and of fermentation is by no means limited to the passages that we have been considering. Those passages should not be used to confirm an extreme position that will not harmonize with the teachings as found in other places. The symbolism of leavening and of fermenting, in a multitude of places, is pictured as the direct opposite of a purifying and cleansing process. In "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 1001 we read, that leaven represents "what is man's own which is filthy" and "what was leavened signifies what is corrupt and defiled." In A. C., n. 9992 (2), "fermenting signifies falsity from evil, hence . . . 'unleavened' signifies pure, or without this falsity. That 'fermented' signifies falsity from evil is because this defiles good, and also truth." In another number, 2177 (5): "Its being . . . not fermented signifies its being sincere . . . and without uncleanness." In the doctrines, "unleavened" is always given as signifying things purified from falsity and evil; we will

refer to but one passage: A. C., n. 10656. "Thou shalt eat unleavened things . . . this signifies the appropriation of Divine Truth purified from evil and the falsity of evil."

We now come to the consideration of the decisive question, as to whether or not we are safe in applying the beautiful symbolism of that which is unfermented and unleavened, to the clarified and sterilized juice of fresh and fragrant grapes. That the ordinary must of the wine-press, the same day it is produced, is as much a contaminated product as the milk of an ordinary dairy, the science of today would affirm. Swedenborg, in speaking of such must, says that it "tastes sweet but infests the stomach." In at least one passage in the Old Testament, Joel 1:5, the term "must" (Swedenborg's translation of the Hebrew *Asis*) is used as if it caused drunkenness. That is, the term *mustum* as used by him, seems to include the juice even after it is well along in the process of fermentation. That correspondences based on the infected condition of such "turbid," "foul" and "offensive" must, might well have a low or evil signification, is obvious. But that must, considered as the pure blood and juice of the grape, in many places in the Doctrines, is given the very highest signification, is easily established. And this fact, it seems to us, disproves absolutely the contention that the "fruit of the vine" is only fit to serve in the Holy Supper after it has first served as food for the bacteria of fermentation.

As to the correspondence of must, we read in "Apocalypse Explained" 644 (6): "The spiritual and celestial good and truth which the man of the church has thence, are meant by the corn, *must* and oil." In another place A. E. 618 (4), "'must' signifies the truth of the Word"; again, A. C. 10137 (4): "By 'must' is (signified) all the truth of the church." Now let us give two or three references where 'must' is grouped with wine and given the same significance. A. E. 695 (23): "'must' like 'wine' signified truth from the good of charity or love." A. E. 376 (18): "By 'wine' and 'must' is meant the truth of the church." "Apocalypse Revealed" 316 (4): "*Holy truth is signified*

by 'must' and 'wine' in other places also in the Word." A. R. 653: "by 'blood out of the wine-press' is meant the blood and wine from the trodden clusters, and by 'must' and 'wine' *like things* are signified." It should be very evident, from these passages, that according to the God-given illumination of Swedenborg, the fermenting process is by no means needed to give the "fruit of the vine" the very highest significance.

If the fact that it is fermented is not the source of the high correspondence of wine, then whence is the origin of the exalted symbolism of both wine and must? If we grasp the answer to this question clearly, it seems to me, we enter into the one fundamental truth of the whole wine question; and there is no shadow of doubt as to what that answer is. Both wine and must have their holy significance, solely because they are both derived from the vine and the grape. It was as "the fruit of the vine," we recall, that the Lord referred to the communion cup. The "grape" signifies the good of love—not the good and delight of an altogether natural and earth-born love; but the good of as spiritual or celestial a charity and love as we are able to receive. "Wine" and "must" signify the God-given and delightful perceptions concerning the goodness and beauty of an unselfish and heavenly love—perceptions that flow from the beginning of such a love possessed and experienced. All of the living truth that we possess, flows into our perceptions through the measure of love from the Lord that we have been able and willing to accept. Thus "wine" and "must" signify the truths of love because they both are derived from grapes, that symbolize a heavenly love from the Lord animating our lives.

Just a word from the writings, in confirmation of this truth. We read in A. C. 1071 (3): "As faith is no other than charity, and essentially is charity itself—as grapes signify charity, so wine signifies the faith thence derived, *for wine is from grapes.*" In A. E. 922, we are taught "by a 'wine-press' and the '*treading*' of it, is signified the *bringing forth of truth out of good*, because the grape sig-

nifies spiritual good; and the wine from the grape, truth from this good."

Truth brought forth from good reveals the nature and quality of that good. Ripe grapes, because of their goodness, correspond to a sweet and heavenly love. The truth symbolism of both wine and must results from the fact that both are "brought forth" from the grape. Then, of the two substances, that one which most truly reveals the quality and goodness of the grape should possess the higher correspondence. By this test there is no room for doubt. You crush the luscious grapes, and the sweet, fresh and fragrant juice gushes out, and in the aromas, flavors and goodness of that juice the quality and deliciousness of the grape itself stands revealed. The grape, representing a heavenly love; its own juice represents the revealed quality and goodness of that love. We all can see that no such perfect revelation of the actual qualities of the ripened grapes is found in the juice after it has been contaminated by leaven and radically changed in all its qualities by fermentation. The truths that flow immediately from a heavenly love require no mental mutations before being assimilated into life and character. From this, it would seem that any serious change in the pure juice of the grape should have a weakening influence upon its symbolic character, as representing truth brought forth from good.

We know enough of the chemistry and physical significance of fermentation to realize that the change wrought is revolutionary. We know that the leavened must contains countless millions of multiplying bacteria. Whether the decomposing action of fermentation takes place altogether within the bacteria or is caused in part by substances secreted by them, seems to be a disputed point; but no one questions that this alien life, in one way or another, causes the destructive action that takes place.

Some may be inclined to question whether we are justified in using such severe terms as "destructive action" and "decomposition" in describing the chemical changes wrought by fermentation. But a glance at the facts should

establish the accuracy of such expressions. An average sweet must, in spite of its 78 per cent. of water, is rich in nourishment—containing 20 per cent. of grape sugar. (Article on Wine, “Americana Encyc.”). This sweet, warmth and energy producing, food-content of the grape, and its juice, is largely consumed in the fermenting process—only traces of sugar remaining. Nearly half of this food-content is changed into alcohol, commonly considered as a drug and poison. Roughly speaking, the other half, by weight, of the sugar, is absolutely destroyed and lost, as far as the wine is concerned, being given off in the form of carbon dioxide gas. An average sweet must, during fermentation, gives off over forty times its own volume of this suffocating gas of decomposition. Surely, such disintegrating and dissipating action is nothing short of destructive.

While we are dealing with the decomposition of the sugars of the grape juice into gas and alcohol, let us remember the beautiful correspondence that Swedenborg gives to the sweetness and flavors that are thus destroyed. A. C. 5117:

And the clusters thereof ripened grapes, . . . this signifies the conjunction of spiritual truth with celestial good. . . . In unripe fruits, . . . is represented the state when truth still predominates; but in ripe fruits, which are grapes, is represented the state when good has the predominance; the predominance of good being represented also in the *flavors and sweetness* which are perceived in *ripe grapes*.

In all that we have said relative to the disintegrating action of ferment, we are not attempting to disprove the fact that alcoholic wine is still, in a sense “the fruit of the vine” and as such possesses a high and holy significance. As a further natural basis for a good representation, fermented wine doubtless has had an important use in diet. Natural wine, containing acids, flavors, and traces of sugar and mineral salts, has some food value even apart from its alcohol content. As regards alcohol, the present-day drift of scientific evidence seems to be increasingly hostile to the idea that alcohol, by itself, is anything else than a drug and

a poison. Still, in primitive times, when diet was generally very limited in range, the alcohol of the wine may have served a considerable use in stimulating the digestion and assimilation of the bread or other monotonous food that was taken with it. This use would be in addition to any possible food value in the alcohol itself. All we are seeking to prove is that the pure juice, as it is in the ripened grape, or as it is in a clarified and sterilized unfermented wine, has a higher correspondence than the wine that has been radically changed by the bacteria of fermentation. That is, we are seeking to make plain that the destructive action of fermentation gives to the resulting alcoholic wine a discretely lower representation.

As we have seen, both must and wine, considered as the fruit of the vine, are given the same general signification. Still, as natural substances they are very unlike. The one preserves the flavors, aroma and sweet goodness of the grape, the other, to an unperverted taste, is sour, acrid and alcoholic. The one is rich in genuine nourishment, the other is saturated with a nerve-punishing stimulant. It seems evident that relative to each other, two such radically different substances must have a discretely different significance. The question at once arises: "How can there be superior and inferior 'holy truth' proceeding from the Lord's Divine Humanity?" Divine Truth, as it is in that Humanity, of course is one in its infinite perfection; still, as received by finite beings, it must needs adapt itself to the recipient conditions found in man.

We believe the doctrines make it plain that there are two discretely different types of men in present-day humanity: the one of the affectional or celestial type, and the other of the colder intellectual or spiritual genus. The doctrines also make it evident that these two types are radically different in the quality of truth which they are able to receive from the Lord. The "truth from good" of the celestial church and genus is thus altogether purer and sweeter than the "truth from good" with the man of the spiritual type.

This difference is most wonderfully represented by the relative quality and integrity of the two kinds of wine.

In mentioning the difference between the celestial and spiritual, we are calling up a subject that is so little considered in the church that confirmation from the doctrines may be needed to convince of even the existence now of these two distinct types within the church universal. But first, a general word of explanation of the term "celestial genus": It does not mean that the present-day man of that designation is like the man of the Most Ancient Church in the days of its integrity, any more than it means that he is like the later and unspeakably corrupt Antediluvians of that same church. He receives a different influx and lives in a different spiritual environment. With the creation of the spiritual type of man and mentality, the remnants of the celestial genus, perhaps, have received from them, or from the spiritual heavens through guardian angels of that type, something of the new power of thought detachment from affectional impulses, that is characteristic of the man of the lower, spiritual, genus. Explain it as we may, it would seem that the natural reason of the man of the celestial genus has been protected, strengthened and stabilized in such a way as to save him from the moral insanities and headlong degeneracy of the Antediluvians.

Being of the celestial genus does not mean that a man is necessarily better than others. The whole negro race is of that genus. If a man of this genus chooses the evil instead of the good, he becomes the worst of men in this life, and after death a devil in the lower hells. Again, the fully regenerate man of the spiritual type, at death, ascends to his home in the spiritual heavens; while the merely well-disposed man of the celestial type finds his place on a discretely lower plane in the ultimate or natural heavens.

With these safeguarding thoughts premised, we are ready to consider the doctrinal confirmation of the existence of the two distinct types within the church. We cannot complete our thought concerning the symbolism of the two kinds of wine, till the ground is thus prepared.

We read, A. C. 2078: "there are two kinds of men within the church—the spiritual, and the celestial. The spiritual become rational by truth, but the celestial by good." A. C. 2114: "he that was born in the house, and he that was bought with silver. That this signifies all those within the church, is evident from the signification of 'him that was born in the house' as being the celestial; and from the signification of 'bought with silver' as being the spiritual . . . for all who are within the church are either celestial or spiritual." In A. C. 6296 (2), we read: "there are few with whom there is anything sound in the will part; thus, few who can become celestial men, but many who can become spiritual."

With the presence in the Church of two distinct types of men established as thoroughly as brevity permits, let us seek a clear grasp of the difference of the Lord's saving truth as received by each. Concerning the "wine of truth" with the celestial man we read, A. C. 1043 (4): "When the man's will part is such that it can receive the rays of celestial flame, then his intellectual part is enlightened thereby, and from love he knows and perceives all things that are truths of faith." Again, in A. C. 6240, we read: "a truly rational man is no other than the celestial man, . . . the rational is to see and perceive inwardly that *good* is *good*, and that thence truth is truth, for the sight and perception of these things is from heaven."

From these beautiful words we learn that the celestial man is capable of sensing the inherent goodness and delightfulness of unselfish love and conduct. From this, he has no need to reason or argue himself into a true doctrine of life. Because from experience he knows something of the sweetness that is in mutual love, it follows that all things of right conduct and neighborly kindness possess for him a luminous and self-evident quality. The sweet, unreasoned wine of his truth flows immediately from the grapes of love! And there is a heavenly warmth and strength-giving nourishment for right thinking and right conduct in the unperverted sweetness of that wine. In this

quality of truth we can see there is nothing to intoxicate or make insane.

What a different picture we are given of the truth conditions with the man of the closed spiritual genus. In A. C. 1043 (4) we read: "with every regenerate man of the spiritual church . . . his cloud is dense, for he needs to learn what is good and true, and has no perception whether it is so. Then, also, falsity, continually flows in . . . from his black will part—that is, through it, from hell. This is why the intellectual part can never be enlightened in the spiritual man, as it is in the celestial." In A. C. 4788, we find "that they do good, not for its own sake, but because it is commanded, and for the most part they think of recompense; their joy is from this, and also from glorying. From this it is evident . . . that those who do good from truth (the spiritual) do it from some external affection." In other words, the man of the spiritual type is incapable of sensing the delightful quality of a humble self-forgetfulness. It follows that he has no basis in experience for recognizing the axiomatic values of truth. He loves to reason about doctrine, yet he is easily entangled in the thickets of sensuous thought. His highest conceptions of right and duty are a learned and labored product. Lacking in any perception of truth, the wine of the Lord's truth, with him, becomes at first mere learned memory knowledges. This turbid and infected "must" is sweet with the merely natural delight in learning and obeying what he is taught is truth. Impure and unleavened, this must of natural knowledges needs to be worked over by the man's more or less enlightened reason, before the good in it can be recognized and interiorly acknowledged. So, with the spiritual type, "must" represents natural truth and "wine" spiritual truth. While this mental fermentation purifies his faith of "heterogeneous" elements and "clarifies" it, still it is not a purifying of the inflowing truth vitality from the Divine Humanity. This inflowing wine of truth from the Lord, seeking to nourish his thought and life, in this reasoning process, is subjected to the disintegrating action of

"falsity from evil." Persuasions born of the love of self and of the world, "ferment" the celestial warmth and energy-giving sweetness largely out of the inflowing life, transforming it into the stimulating alcohol of natural motive and a recognized self-interest in obeying truth. But this wine of the Lord's inflowing truth, as it is adapted to the recipient conditions of the spiritual man, is not utterly perverted; obscure but saving traces of good remain through which the Lord is able to impart a growing appreciation of the delightful goodness of neighborly love. In moderation, the alcoholic delight in learning and reasoning about religion from pride and self-interest serves a good purpose in stimulating the reception of an obedient and useful life; but indulged in to excess, it leads to spiritual drunkenness and insanity.

We do not suppose that Swedenborg knew anything of a clarified and sterilized unfermented wine. It was no part of his mission to influence our diet or our attitude toward the liquor traffic by discrediting alcoholic liquors. Therefore, it is altogether of the Divine permission that the symbolism of the two kinds of wine was not developed in detail by him. But all the premises from which our conclusions follow are found in the doctrines. It is very significant, for instance, that in his explanation concerning the Lord's institution of the Holy Supper (A. C. 5120) he notes the fact that the Lord, in speaking of the elements, avoided the term "wine," and he gives us an illuminating insight into the reason: "It is said 'cup' and not 'wine' because wine is predicated of the spiritual church . . . and the Holy Supper was instituted to represent and signify the Lord's love toward the whole human race." This is significant, because we know that the word "wine" has stood specifically for the fermented product, and this fermented wine seems thus indicated as the symbol of truth as it is with the spiritual church alone; and this is the reason it was not named in the Holy Supper. The reason that forbade the use of the name of the alcoholic product evidently did not apply to the term "fruit of the vine," for this

broader and more beautiful term is used in a most tender way by the Lord: He speaks of drinking it *new* with them in his Father's Kingdom.

As we have indicated before, the historical evidence points to the use of fermented wine by the Lord in the Last Supper. This suggests the question: Why was the substance itself used if its name could not properly be mentioned? The fact that the Savior was inaugurating the First Christian Church, it seems to me, gives us a clue to the answer. From the doctrines we know that the "First Christian Church and the Ancient Church . . . were altogether the same as to inward things, and only differ as to outward" (A. C. 4772). So the church that the Lord was inaugurating, in its dominant character, was altogether of the closed spiritual type. We know its truth and doctrine soon became the fermented product of human thought and natural interests. If fermented wine is predicated of the spiritual church, it should also be the symbolic wine of the consummated First Christian Church. The many places in the Prophets and in Revelation, in which the corruptions of truth and good by that church are likened to drunkenness, still further strengthen the confirmation. If fermented wine is "predicated" especially of the truth, as it is with the First Christian Church, how can it be an adequate symbol for the doctrine and truth insight that is to characterize the New Dispensation? The radiant doctrines of the "crown of all the churches" are discretely and Divinely different from those that were current in the consummated church. Through the opened and Divinely-illuminated powers of perception provided in Swedenborg, the Lord Himself reveals His rational doctrine to bless and save his church universal. The truth of the New Age is thus in no sense the fermented product of human thought or impulse.

Though the spiritual type may, for centuries, continue to abound, still the unobtrusive but life-giving and qualifying heart of the New Dispensation will surely be of the restored celestial type. Scattered through the Bible are many beautiful prophecies of the restoration and dominance of

the Celestial Church. One of them (Isaiah 2:1-3) is explained in A. E. 433 (19):

This, too, is said of a new church to be established by the Lord, "the mountains of Jehovah" means Zion, and signify the celestial church and love to the Lord which those have who are of that church. That this is the primary thing of the church *and that it is to increase and gain strength*, is signified by "it shall be upon the top of the mountains, and be lifted up above the hills." . . . All nations shall flow unto that mountain . . . "nations" signifying those in celestial good which is the good of love to the Lord; and "peoples," those who are in spiritual good.

From this, it is clear that an ever stronger element of celestial life and perception will safeguard and enrich the warm and golden life of the descending New Jerusalem.

Surely, if alcoholic wine is the specific truth symbol of the First Christian Church, then a new wine is needed to truly represent the Lord's Holy City presence in truth. Through the New Age knowledge of how to clarify, sterilize and preserve the sweet, fresh and fragrant juice, just as it flows from the ripened grapes, it seems to me, the Lord's providence has graciously given us the needed new symbol of the heavenly New Wine of the New Church.

If these things are true, then the Christian peoples of the New Dispensation are free to let go of the alcoholic symbol of a past and consummated dispensation, and as we look into the future, we may vision the entire social life of the New Age as cleansed of the blight of the liquor traffic. If the world-wide anti-alcohol movement is ordained of God, surely we of the New Church should sense that fact and do our best in hastening its complete triumph.

LLOYD HASTINGS EDMISTON.

THE STORIES OF JOSEPH, MOSES AND JOSHUA.

(THE WORD AS A WHOLE: SECOND SERIES, VI)

BY THE REV. CLARENCE LATHBURY.

THE Bible is the Book of the World containing the story of the world in innumerable representatives, picturing man in his life-growth,—in its fullest and holiest sense, the career on earth of the Man of men. In its wider range, it is the story of divine and human progress—and yet every smallest part a whole in miniature, compassing as completely the entire circuit. Like the human form it is as finished in its minutiae as in its entirety, mirroring earth and heaven; as the sea and the diamond, with equal ease, hold the sun and stars.

The whole story is told in the first chapter of Genesis where is seen the progress step by step of a heavenly spirit in man under the beaming of Divine Love and Wisdom, closing with the perfected individual in the likeness of Jehovah; the various processes of spiritual creation and expression represented by the six days of labor, ending with the Sabbath peace—the whole compassing the seven periods of regeneration.

A story as complete and significant lies embedded in the Edenic parable, reflecting the Golden Age sung by poets and crystallized in art, reminder of the possibilities of a being filled with the influences of innocent love. It is the first compassing of the goal in childhood, the hindering angel with the flashing sword indicating the initial disobedience, crossing a barrier never to be retraced in identical experiences.

These, with many others that might be mentioned, are complete in themselves yet in significant phases essentially different each from the other. The novice in correspon-

dences may behold apparent repetitions, feel that the Word is turning on its own footsteps; the fact is, however, it never does, each seeming iteration being another gleam of infinite revelation, each containing similar substance, as each flower holds in chemical combination like properties of earth, air and sky, while in its individuality an entirely new unit.

In a general way it is seen that the Scriptures treat of the development of manhood, from the young innocence of Eden to the complex and matured innocence of the Golden City; also of the birth, growth and exinanition of the Savior of mankind. We find however this same circuit made in many minor parts of the Word with equal completeness and clearness. It is true that to the novice, sometimes to the veteran, there is an appearance that the narrative is covering and recovering the ground; it is however seen that those paths which, casually glanced at, appear circular, considered more closely turn out to be spiral, always leaving the traveler, if at the same point of the circumference, on higher ground. To examine the various parts and see how they stand relatively one to the other is not to deny the finality and perfection of each part in itself. The field is undulating, human states declining and rising, and declining to rise again from creation through the long stretches of Divine representatives to the Lord's first coming, and then once more onward leaving the situation at his second coming on the final heights of the Holy City. It is a long account of attainment and apparent losses, of seeming iteration, as succeeding days have likeness, and yet new and different; like revolving seasons, no one the precise duplicate of another nor the stale account of something past. The Infinite One never repeats himself, his opulent hand beyond need of repetition, which happening if it could would at that moment cease to be a living fact. In man's numerous experiences he is learning the same lessons, as yet only partially possessed, not by a verbal account of past ones, but by contending with something absolutely new. The same nail is driven to its place by another hammer, the

only way man can get truths into his permanent grasp, truth being forever won as the ancient racers compassed the goal seven times, or when through the traveling of his seven ages man arrives at the innocence of self-knowledge and self-control.

With this preliminary we reach the greater period under contemplation today, in its entire range covering the ground from the migration of Abram out of Ur to the occupation of Canaan under Joshua and the Judges—the more particular consideration of the hour being the history of Joseph, Moses and Joshua, parenthetically within the larger period mentioned. Following the Adamic feature of young innocence, is a new application in Noah covering that point of development where heavenly influences begin to be shadowed by the child's awakening interest in the things of sense. It is the distinctive feature of the period of Noah to correlate and blend heavenly innocence with earthly science, where the soul beholds for the first time inner states mirrored in outward objects. In the application to the individual, Noah answers to that time of sense awakening when the child becomes a little interrogation point, the things of the world commanding constant and curious attention. From this on to Abraham there is a gradual eclipse of the mind Godward and a steadily increasing regard for the world for its own sake.

At Abraham we transcend allegory and enter the domain of history and biography where the actual relations of outward happenings are so accounted for as to serve all the purposes of allegory, the inner picture and the literal condition often entirely unlike, and yet which to the apprehension of the New-Churchman is a divinely clear, consecutive and permanent moral story. There are, of course, many applications, but in its general narration it shows where the child's innocent nature, submerged by the senses, reaches its nadir and begins to ascend step by step to more spiritual conditions symbolized in the graduated journey of Abram to Canaan, at which time he had no possessions, daily pitching his tent where the setting sun overtook him.

The only perfect application of the story is however to the experiences of our Lord in the world, the period of Abraham representing his boyhood at those first states of instruction when he awoke to a recognition of his inherited evil nature, rediscovered in the Word the history of his own Divine life and began to realize that the very springs of that life were in himself. He is now seen leaving the condition of worldly submergence in which he was born and, advancing toward a knowledge of divine things that would make him a blessing to men and bring his destiny to the point outlined in Divine prophecy.

Jacob follows as the spiritual history of the development and ordering of the natural mind and will in obedience to the teachings of Divine revelation, putting into commission those literal truths which compose the practical system of heavenly order in the world, showing the varieties of heavenly experience in men and creeds; and in the Lord a perception of every variety of good life, and the love of living it; the incident of Israel in Egypt pointing out that an abode remote from the Lord and heaven is not the normal condition of man and cannot long endure.

The history of Joseph and Moses make an application chiefly to the Church; yet there are many reminders beneath the surface of the experiences of the Lord himself. May not Joseph suggest the Lord's growing perception of his own divinity? As in the youth influences from above seem to wane, objects of earth becoming more actual, may we not say that the Lord's consciousness of his own divinity faded in the presence of his expanding interest in the objects of sense, which consciousness he regained through his knowledge of the Scriptures where it was all recorded? History relates that when Joseph was born Jacob returned, with his sons and all that he had, into Canaan. Later, in Egypt, the goal of knowledge seems to have been touched, and here, as before, there could be no place of rest, for knowledge is not love; the bones of Joseph did not remain in Egypt but in Canaan. The climax of the knowledge state in our Lord seems to have been reached when Joseph

became lord over all the land of Egypt, when the knowledge of his divinity had brightened until all other knowledge and power became subordinated to it.

As to the individual, may not Joseph be freely interpreted in terms of regeneration? The soul reaching step by step the state of entire conviction of the divinity of the Lord, to which is joined later on in the history the ability rationally to understand and explain that divinity. May not the seven years of storage represent the receptive and inquiring times of youth when there are deepening inclinations for better things? and the years of sustenance the retrospection and strength of having long ago walked with God, accompanied with the remembrance of blessings on the way? Or, turning another angle of the history, may not the years of plenty remind us of the value of hoarding sacred knowledge through faithful study, in times when we do not need to use it, to be drawn upon later, little by little, when the heart cries for deliverance? May not this phase of the story emphasize the value of the study of truth not at present usable, or applicable, laid up for future times of divine hunger and thirst?

And now follows an experience of bondage and persecutions, closing with a sharp, brief deliverance, only to be plunged immediately into another epoch of trial. Once again the forward march is resumed and the soul having broken its manacles of sense, is now to be tutored to higher commands, the loosing of Satan's rule is effected, and the culture of the entire personality is at hand, this period reaching its culmination when the matured youth makes the divine law the code of his conduct, and conscience is held invincibly by its sway. The youth's training to obedience is represented by the baffling persistent wilderness traveling, its end having been reached when conscience is imperial and evil strongly and instantly resisted. To Moses was intrusted the birth and development of self-compulsion, of pruning and driving the personality to a definite attainment, through it all the often-fainting spirit fed with food of God, its way lighted with radiance from

above. The mind now trained to the influences of truth and love is nerved for the long and difficult traveling, when sight must be often dim and peace disturbed. By faith it sees the journey accomplished and views the land of promise from afar.

The incidents of the wilderness are crowded with correspondences applicable to the individual, casting also a brightness on the mystery of human progress. It is a picture of the systematising of society, and the individual, culminating in the structure of the Tabernacle, man arranged according to the pattern in the mount, humanity set up as a temple of worship, "according to the measure of an angel." There are some evident and beautiful hints at the likeness of man in God—the (shepherds') rod the new teaching from the Lord wielded with authority; the (plagues) the clearing of the ground preparatory for the structure of the new man about to be reared, the Passover preparation, the heart-searching for evil, its condemnation and rout and the soul's gaze upward for strength; the smiting angel and the great deliverance of the sea ushering the soul into untried paths directed by pillars of cloud and fire, symbols of protecting and guiding Love through all the processes of regeneration, indicating that the ways of heavenly experience are plainly visible to faith if divine reasons are not always clear; the tragic and mystic wrestling of heart and flesh indicated by the fiery serpents while the journey had scarcely begun, when young and keen aspirations for God are benumbed by sudden and unexpected temptations to fleshly indulgence, the cure of the soul provided in the uplifted salvation and the return to the Mount of God.

The life now reduced to permanent order, the law of heaven for men in the world is builded in the plain, and man as the temple of God elaborately symbolized by the Tabernacle and its holy furniture. The inner sanctuary where the eternal light never dies away and the law of Jehovah engraven legibly on the heart; the domain of thought and reason and determination one remove without the veil where golden lamps burn, the bread of God spread

upon the ample table, and the perfume of prayers and praises rising to the Giver of all good.

Through the vicissitudes of those rounded and militant years in the desert Israel seems to have attained symmetry, self-control and firmer confidence in Jehovah. She camped like a lion at rest, felt that Jehovah was with her, and the shout for a king was heard in her midst. The uses of her training are now applied to the occupancy of the land of promise under Joshua and the line of Judges. Here once more, however, we enter the field of conflicts prefigured by "the man with the drawn sword in his hand," from which there is only temporary deliverance under one judge and another.

And now comes the suggestion of the greatest of battles fought on the arena of the world—that of the Redeemer with the allied hells, that mystical and tragic struggle we can but faintly comprehend from experiences of our own on a lesser field. He fought that we might successfully fight, fought, indeed, that we might (live), for without that battle humanity must have perished. On the flesh-plane he met also in himself those hereditary instincts, those malignant remnants of iniquity until now practically quiescent. It was the final rout of a foe that could never again offer him battle because, unlike us, the evil in him was extinguished instead of removed. He put the finite entirely out of a body that became effulgent with Easter glory.

Applying to the individual, the entrance into Canaan prefigures the regenerating life in its final acts of progression, the evil ejected little by little as the soul fights its way to the center of accomplishment. And now the soldier of God is apt to congratulate himself that victory sits permanently upon his banner, while he actually stands upon the borders of more deadly and beguiling impulses that rise up with a new call to arms. After the experiences of the Wilderness,—the marches forward, the retreats, the triumphs and discouragements,—the soul reaches the outskirts of its long and fierce problem, enters the new land and eats the

corn and wine with gladness, feeling that it has now "the peace that passeth understanding." But at this very hour of gratulation the "man with the drawn sword" stands upon the plains of Jericho, and the embattled walls of a seemingly impregnable city confronts him. And so it is onward once more into fiercer struggles than any that have been experienced. But the Great Leader calls and the soul follows.

If it is not difficult to learn the truths that lead to heaven it takes long to fully live them out, new enemies are met at every turn in the road, inveterate habits of thought, hidden and deadly volitions issue from the deeper places of the being and challenge battle. "The law is our school-master to lead us to Christ," but when it seems to us we have learned much, have apparently reduced ourselves to order, a whole new campaign comes to view. Entrenched in the choicest portions of being, other and more malignant foes are discovered. The elimination of the last remnants of selfishness demand the leadership of Jesus in a new and closer way. Piloted out of bondage to false thought under Moses, Joshua must lead in the contest with the malignities of impulse. The power of Jesus in the soul is the only power that will uproot those deeper and more clinging sins of volition. The rout of the last vestiges of sense, the enemy at his final stand, the fiercest battle of human history crowns the letter with the spirit. The law of God is now engraven in the heart and divine Love becomes all and in all. Moses subdues false conceptions, Joshua uproots those deadly things that had driven their fibres through the heart. Moses, victorious in the intellect, is succeeded by Joshua triumphant in the hidden and rooted evils of impulse.

And so the developed youth instructed in the representatives of spiritual progress, trained to systematic habits of conduct and worship, is succeeded by the man in conflict with the more insidious evils of his will—to be followed later by the period of the Kings—the strivings after rational power.

CLARENCE LATHBURY.

THE SOUL OF AMERICA.

BY HON. RICHARD KENNA CAMPBELL.

IT is not possible to think of any question more appropriate for the investigation and consideration of this Convention at any time, and more especially upon this occasion which represents the centennial of its original meeting, than the subject which is about to engage our thoughts—the soul of America. This body represents the church which is the custodian of what we believe to be the latest revelation of the Divine truth, and as entitled to be called in the writings, “the crown of all churches.” It exists, as do all other institutions upon this earth—for the sake of mankind—but it differs from all other institutions in the fact that it exists for mankind as spiritual beings. It has, therefore, peculiarly the care of the human soul, and, in this country, of that human soul in the aggregate which is represented in the expression, “The Soul of America.” To some extent, in a special sense, this church has been in active operation in our country for more than a century. At the end of this period it does well to “take account,” to use a mercantile phrase, of the condition of the subject with which it has had to deal all these years, and with which it is to deal in all future times.

The first step in this “taking of account” is to define in as precise terms as possible, that which is to be the subject of accounting. To set that clearly and distinctly before our mental vision necessarily precedes any intelligent consideration of what we are dealing with. To begin with, the question may be asked, “Is there any peculiarly American soul?” as distinguished from the soul of any other nationality. The affirmative of this proposition would be gratifying to our sense of national vanity, which is sometimes mistaken for patriotism. Precisely in the same way that we of the New Church cherish a sort of feeling, self-

acknowledged or otherwise, that there is a distinctively New-Church soul; and yet upon investigation it would not be difficult to show that such impressions are more the result of that insidious and all-pervading characteristic of the human soul, self-love, than of any essential difference between the American soul and the soul of any other nationality. In the creation of mankind we have the highest assurance that the Father "fashioneth their hearts alike." Any difference, therefore, that exists between man and man as individuals or man and man in the national or racial sense, must be the result of man's own exercise of his free will. If, therefore, there is any distinctively American soul, it is rather in the distinctive manifestations in this country and under our local conditions of the *human soul*, and it is to these manifestations that this body representing the New Church, must direct its consideration, if the purpose is to be one of accomplishing some useful end, rather than purely academic inquiry.

If any one will set himself down seriously to analyze his own feelings and purposes with a view to gauging his own soul and forming some estimate of its nature he will be in a position to practically realize how impossible it would be to define in detail the composite soul of a great people, consisting of some one hundred millions of individual souls. This fact, however, need not discourage us in making the inquiry, because there are certain conspicuous and obvious outward evidences so general and so widespread as to give an unmistakable view of some aspects of that composite soul, just as there are certain characteristic acts of our own from which each of us may be able to gain a clear vision of some feature of our own individual souls. These manifestations are either such as, on the one hand, are highly gratifying to our personal vanity as individuals, or to our national spirit of self-glorification; or they are, on the other hand, such as shock us inexpressibly and lead us to turn our backs upon them as we would instinctively upon some outward object of impurity. Perhaps there is in this instinctive turning away from self-exposure of what

is repulsive a tribute to its opposite. We may at least comfort ourselves with that view until we find out, if we do so find, that the motive which caused the turning away was not one wholly of repulsion because of any hatred of what had been disclosed to us, but because of the possible effect the same revelation would have upon others in their estimate of us. The important thing, however, whatever its immediate effect upon ourselves, is that we have caught a glimpse of something in our own souls upon which we are unwilling to gaze. There is something there which should not be there. The introspection from which this perception resulted has accomplished its purpose. It has acted the part of an able diagnostician and disclosed the presence of the disease. This is the first step which precedes a reform.

Now this is the aspect of the American soul which it is the purpose of the present paper to lay bare so far as it may be possible, and the design of such exposure must not be for a moment confounded with any supposed attitude of pessimism. The design in view is one rather of optimism. There is no use in exposing faults unless by their exposure it be possible to remove them, and it is in the belief that this Convention represents the true church which can furnish the means of a removal of the faults which are peculiarly national that some of those faults are pointed out for our consideration.

Before directing attention to those peculiar manifestations of the human soul in this country which appear to make that soul sufficiently distinctive to justify the appellation, "The American Soul," it is of the highest importance for us to glance for a moment at the distinctive system of government under which we live, under which the American soul has reached its present stage of development after more than 100 years of separate national existence. That soul in this country has been freed from certain conventions which in foreign lands have restrained the free outward expression of the human soul. In other words, it has been able in the United States in a peculiar degree to select

the lines along which it should develop "in freedom and according to reason," and, therefore, in a peculiar sense, in the United States it is possible to form a correct conclusion from outward manifestations as to inward states. And it will be interesting and practically useful to consider whether the American soul, to judge by the most conspicuous surface indications, has developed upward or downward, under these free institutions.

The basic principle of our national life, expressed in political terminology, is in substance the Golden Rule. It recognizes the inalienable right of the individual man to the opportunity for development in freedom from undue restraint or restriction. If devotion to this principle exists in the American soul, collectively, as an essential part, thereof, that soul cannot disregard it; it cannot tolerate violations or evasions of it in individual cases or for individual advantage. Genuine love cannot antagonize the object of its devotion. Genuine love must cherish that object under all conditions and at any apparent sacrifice of self. This is a proposition that is so obvious and one as to which the church which this body represents has such a profound knowledge that it does not require argument to sustain it.

It is not necessary in the recital of the manifestations of the American soul which follows to do more than to state the simple facts leaving the inevitable inference to be drawn from them, but it is necessary that we honestly acknowledge that, unpleasant as the thought may be, we are a part of that composite soul; that the inferences may reflect not alone upon individuals or classes of individuals but upon us all, for we must realize that those of us who are not among the particular classes or individuals by whom these manifestations are made, are not so as the result of the Divine Mercy. And we must realize that, but for that mercy, were we in the like situation with those individuals or classes of individuals, the probability, if not the certainty, is that the expression of our individual souls would be the same.

There is still another point to be guarded in estimating the nature of this American soul, and that is that we may be misled by the hasty conclusion drawn from conspicuous outward events, that there is not much, if any, goodness in the American soul because if there was, such goodness would be more manifest. This is a mistake. The hope of the world today, as in all past ages, has been in the soul of its inconspicuous, humble-minded, and as we designate them, ignorant peoples, that class designated as the "common people" in the significant statement that, when all others derided Him, "the common people heard Him gladly." Other speakers will doubtless discuss the American soul as exemplified in this class of people, whose daily acts never come, or hardly ever come, to the attention of the public, but for the purpose of this paper it is sufficient to consider as the diagnostician of disease does, those manifestations of the American soul, a knowledge of which makes it possible for the church to treat the disease disclosed, for a discussion of the subject based upon any other ground would constitute simply a love feast, a feast of self-glorification; and whatever else the American soul may need, no one will dare to assert that its spirit of self-glorification needs any encouragement.

If we will close our eyes for a moment to our present external surroundings and try to visualize the world in which our ancestors lived when this country achieved its national independence, we may comprehend something of the vast distances to be traveled, the difficulties of communication between the different parts of the country, the immense area of wilderness to be reduced to a habitable condition, the crudeness and inconvenience of all the appliances for human comfort and security; and then re-open our eyes and look around us, we must concede without question that one of the chief characteristics, if not the chief characteristic, of the human soul, is achievement—the triumph of the human will—the American will, if you please, over the obstacles of inert physical nature. It is not necessary to recite what has been accomplished by

modern science and by modern industry. The facts are familiar to every one. The result is the wonder of the world. Now what effect has this marvelous achievement produced on the American soul? A sense of self-sufficiency. What else would it naturally produce? The American soul, therefore, is an optimistic soul, one of sublime optimism, one of supreme confidence in man's own ability, in man's own power; and to doubters the American soul points to the visible evidence and asks for a judgment with confidence. There is nothing that it cannot do that it desires to do. In the heavens above, that is, the air, in the earth beneath or in the waters under the earth, there is nothing that it cannot do, or perhaps we might say, that it is not doing. The results, outwardly, are such as to confer benefits, at least material benefits, if not spiritual, upon the entire human race. But is this peculiar manifestation of the American soul which breeds this spirit of self-sufficiency raising or lowering that soul from a spiritual point of view? Before this body it is unnecessary to give an answer to this question. The statement carries with it its own answer.

Turning from the consideration of the manifestations of the American soul along inventive and constructive lines, let us glance at some of its manifestations in what is called "the business world." Here again we find that elemental quality of optimism, of self-confidence, manifested in a form of vast achievement. The distinguishing characteristics of American business are the vast sums involved in its transactions, the immense aggregations of smaller enterprises of like kind by which it is conducted and the almost inconceivable gains which it secures. The day of the private individual "merchant prince" is past. The business soul of America finds its expression in corporate activity. By it the consolidation of the small private business undertakings or of a whole range of business of a particular class, into one colossal institution, exercises virtually a complete and exclusive control over the article in which it deals. It would merely result in prolixity and delay to give illus-

trations in support of this statement. They abound on every hand and are known to every man. There is nothing in life, that is, American life, that is more conspicuous and more obvious even to the least observant. Of course, business conducted under these conditions loses more and more of its personal characteristics and becomes more and more a mechanical affair. Between business and its customers the relations that subsist are less human of necessity, and equally exclude those human feelings of good will or resentment which so largely govern a man's relations to man; the great corporation does not even know its customers individually and therefore, if an entity which under a fiction of the law is "without a soul" can be said to entertain any such thing as a feeling, its only motive for any attitude toward its customers or any act toward those customers would be the motive of gain, and in this it will go so far only as it may be necessary to go as a matter of profit to itself. In other words, the human consideration between the great seller and the great buyer has been displaced by a purely mechanical relation, a law of profit. It is true that the operation of such a law intelligently applied enforces the need of satisfying the buyer as the condition of the retention of his business and the extension of it to others. Here again, though, the question arises, identical with that which has been noted already, does the success of business under such a mechanical law, though it be productive of some material benefit, develop the American soul upward or downward? Again, the answer to this question from the New-Church point of view, or perhaps it should rather be said from the spiritual point of view, is perfectly obvious. If there is the smallest doubt upon this point, it would only be necessary to consider certain conspicuous facts. Some of these great captains of industry who organized and operate the corporate expression of the business ideals of the American soul have accumulated private fortunes running up not simply into the millions, but in individual cases, into the hundreds of millions. It is obvious that this vast aggregation represents the productive toil

of humanity and is gathered from those toilers by means of small assessments added to the price of what those toilers need or think they need, at all events, added to the price of what those toilers buy. Does the American soul disclose any sign that it perceives that there is inconsistency with the fundamental law, spiritual or natural, to love one's neighbor as one's self, in such a vast accumulation of public earnings in one hand? Not at all. On the contrary, the American soul is filled with pride as it exhibits these evidences of success achieved under American institutions. It is true a rumbling is heard now and then, and more or less indications accumulate in the form of anti-monopoly or anti-trust laws inspired by those who appear to think that in some way they are being deprived of that equal protection by the law which it was the purpose of our national existence to establish and maintain. But on the whole the American soul is very proud of those great captains of business and finance who from humble and inconspicuous beginnings and still in some instances leading personally humble and rather inconspicuous lives, are yet able with a stroke of their pens to purchase some of the lesser kingdoms of the world without straining their resources. This inspiring picture of what one man can do under free institutions is an incentive, an example, to every ambitious young American whose soul expresses that common sentiment of the American soul that success in life means achievement, that achievement is measured by the acquirement of wealth, that the acquirement of wealth secures publicity and glorification and thus, in these times, when under the laws of Divine permission the process of spiritual vastation is extending from the field of European conflict to the soul of this country, is an inducement to that peculiar desire of the American soul which finds its natural expression in a combination to control the essentials for maintaining physical existence and thus laying a basis for individual success upon the necessities and sufferings of the American people.

If the spirit of American optimism should be tempted

at this point to hold that this picture is overdrawn, let each one of this relatively very small section of the American soul consider its own experiences, particularly those of recent date, and it must in honesty to itself confess that the cost of those things necessary to human existence is far in excess of any price that circumstances of production and distribution would justify. In essence, is such a practice of overcharge justified at any time? Is it not an illustration of indulgence by the American soul in a practice that represents the very antithesis of love to the neighbor? This question does not need an explicit verbal answer, the reply is so obvious.

Perhaps some shocked individual soul may feel as though it is justified in turning its back upon the business methods we have been considering, in unconsciously Pharasaic condemnation of a thing that it must consider essentially dishonest. To such, it may be suggested that the subject under consideration is the collective soul of the people of the United States. We cannot, if we would, blot out the condition described, even as it is, simply by turning our back upon it. Indeed, are we so very sure that that turning back is other than a purely external sign of rejection? Are we sure that there is any sufficient rejection even in the individual sense of a policy of life which places before it as the highest pinnacle to be achieved an ideal of material success? Perhaps if we will make a candid search of our individual souls we may be able to find that we are partakers in the advantages derived from the general policy of availing one's self to the utmost of opportunities that occur to make money or what money represents. As a suggestion to those who feel in any sense in a measure responsible individually for the condition of the composite soul, let him consider whether, if he were an owner of stock in a great corporation, he would pay any attention to rumors that it is through dishonest means that the corporation whose stock he holds has accumulated the profits which enable it to pay the dividends upon its stock. Let me go a step further and inquire whether one ever allows a question

to arise in his own mind as to the methods of business of a company in which he holds stock; whether it ever comes into his mind so long as that stock pays dividends—whether or not his spirit of inquiry is provoked only when he feels the material pinch resulting from a failure to pay dividends and a consequent depreciation of the market value of the stock he holds.

Without exceeding the reasonable limits of such an address it is not possible to go further in our examination of the characteristics of the American soul, even if it were necessary to the purpose of this discussion. Sufficient has been shown to fill us with a spirit of humble acknowledgment of the evils into which we have been betrayed by yielding to that fatal tendency of human souls—the love of self for the sake of self. If the Great War which is overturning and revolutionizing the external physical condition of human existence on this earth, whatever may be its cost in physical sacrifice, in the destruction of life upon this plane of existence, in the wasting of the accumulations of industry, and the destruction of the stores of production, will also revolutionize the human heart and make it once more examine its own motives in the lesser as well as the larger concerns of human existence, and realize the truth that we have all gone astray—Americans not less than Europeans—the price will not be too great for a regenerated American soul, which is a regenerated human soul in the aggregate.

RICHARD KENNA CAMPBELL.

WHAT KNOWLEDGE IS OF MOST WORTH?

BY REV. RUSSELL EATON.

THE parable of the Blossoming of the Fig Tree, is known to New-Church men as a Divine Prophecy of the first effect upon human society of the coming of the Holy City among men. We have heard and read many times, the words,

When ye shall see these things, that is the things concerning the fig tree, then is the consummation of the Church, that is the final judgment and the coming of the Lord, then is the Old Church rejected, and a new one instituted. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 4231.)

This teaching of Swedenborg of the rejection of the Old Church is not to be applied to action taken by the members of our organization. Such rejection would have little or no meaning outside the limits of our membership. The rejection of the Old Church, that Swedenborg declares to be an integral part of the final judgment, must come from within the membership of that Church itself.

I would ask you to consider with me at this time a detail of the blossoming of the fig tree which seems to me in evidence in the changing form of Modern Education, closing with a brief glance at the application of the new spirit, and new point of view in Education, to the study of the Sacred Scriptures.

I suppose the ways of approaching this subject to be as numerous as the leaves on the fig tree. I have selected for this purpose the Essay of Herbert Spencer, famous in educational circles, which has had much to do with setting in motion the reform movement and the new spirit of modern education. This essay is by no means forgotten or neglected. In fact it is in active use in the courses in education in at least one famous University.

Herbert Spencer's answer to our question is, that science is the knowledge that is of most worth.

The system of education as Spencer found it was an inheritance from the past for which the present was only in part responsible. The full power of the Renaissance had given the school curriculum birth. Latin, Greek and Mathematics were then not only the knowledges that were considered most worth while, they were practically all the knowledges that there were. The Modern Languages in a body of literature as we know them today, did not exist as mediums for education and use in the class room. The sciences, other than Mathematics, existed only in the simplest beginnings, as Astrology, Alchemy, and a rude Botany which looked for medicinal herbs. They were not sciences available at that time as educational instruments. In fact the only knowledges that were open to the schools at their beginning in England for the education of youth were reading, writing, arithmetic, and, when done with these, Latin, Greek and higher Mathematics. This curriculum, or course of study, was handed down from generation to generation and still has a tremendous hold on the school system, largely because it has been so long established. We are beginning, however, to find other knowledges as well as these and to recognize their value as a means of helping the pupil to find his work in life.

Mr. Spencer brings a grave charge against the system of education as it was in his day. He says that education is at fault because it does not train its disciples in self preservation, in the obtaining of sustenance, in the bringing forth and rearing of offspring, in good citizenship, nor in the preparation to enjoy the relaxations, pleasures, and amusements, suitable to leisure hours.

It may help us to appreciate the meaning of Mr. Spencer's powerful attack on the then established system of education if we examine further what educators of his day, and indeed to a large extent even now, considered the knowledges most worth while. Mr. Spencer says on this point,

It is true that reading, writing and arithmetic are taught with an intelligent appreciation of their uses, but when we have said this we have said nearly all. . . . That which our school courses leave almost entirely out we thus find to be that which most nearly concerns the business of life. All our industries would cease were it not for that information which men begin to acquire as best they may after their education is said to be finished. The vital knowledge — that by which we have grown as a nation to what we are — has got itself taught in nooks and corners; while the ordained agencies for teaching have been mumbling little else but dead formulas.

This is his judgment of and condemnation upon the accepted system of education as he found it.

People need a sharp jolt to stir them up against the established order of things. Whatever is right, is the conservative state of mind, and there is a strong tendency to conservatism in most people. This essay furnished such a jolt or stimulus. For this essay in the hands of thoughtful people, must either be refuted successfully or a change must be made in the established system of study in the schools. This was its value then. The essay is a sharp and peremptory challenge to any one who still clings to the old ideas of education. This is its value today. In so far as what he says of the education of his own time is still true, that it is a sort of book knowledge which does not bring one into participation in the life of the times, his essay is a challenge to us in its unanswerable condemnation of the artificial and the unpractical. But the title itself indicates one weakness in the essay. It presupposes that either the classics or science on some other one field of knowledge is the best. This position is weak because it is impossible to say what knowledge is of most worth to all sorts and conditions of men. We could say what knowledge is of most worth to this man with his sort of mind, or to that man with his. But to say what knowledge is of most worth to all men equally is impossible. As we soon find on reading the essay, it considers the worth of knowledge from the point of view of one interested in science alone, and does not take into consideration at all the fact that knowledge that may

be of most worth to one pupil whose natural ability is chiefly scientific, will be of less value or none at all to another who is not endowed with such ability. The essay really tells us what knowledge is of most worth to the scientist. But in spite of the fact that it does not give a satisfactory answer to the question which it propounds, it is nevertheless, a noteworthy contribution to our educational literature. It seems especially so when we consider the fact that it was one of the early criticisms of our educational methods, and that it helped largely to institute the change in our school programs which we see going on today. The strength of the essay lies in the forcible pointing out of the true purpose of education, namely a preparation for complete living, together with an equally forcible exposure of the inadequacy of the classics and the school arts, as then taught, in this rather than in the remedy it advocates for the absurd condition of affairs which it discovers in the schools. His plea for science as the cure-all for the ills of the educational system and his advocacy of it as the only means of preparation for complete living is not convincing, while the other parts, what we might call the incidental revelations of the essay, are. His answer to the question, "What knowledge is of most worth?" is thus unsatisfactory.

To continue a little further with the essay, we find that in leading up to and making the point that the extrinsic effects on the pupil's preparation for life, is the proper test to apply to ascertain the worth of certain knowledges rather than what has been considered by past and present generations of men as the intrinsic value of knowledges, Mr. Spencer in a very clever and entertaining argument makes fashion and the love of ornament the chief motives that lead parents to have their children study the school arts as they have been studied in the past, the classics and some of the modern languages. He overlooks here the historical reasons why certain knowledges were considered and all others omitted in the school curriculum. He does make mention in one place of the force of custom, but this is all he says on this point. Now doubtless there is a

sheep-like tendency among men to follow the leader and to be in the fashion by doing those things that "every one does." The important question would seem to be then, not why do most of the sheep follow, but why have the leaders led them as they have? In education the answer to the latter question is the historical reason which I have outlined above, namely, that its origin was at a time when the classics offered the best if not the only means for becoming educated. Mr. Spencer's argument then, which lays so much stress on the love of ornament and the desire to be in the fashion as the reason for the curriculum in our schools, would seem to be of little importance.

I do not mean to give you the idea that Spencer is directing his attack against the classics or against mathematics. He is contending for a due consideration of the relative value of the different things studied. He says:

If there needs further evidence of the rude, undeveloped character of our education, we have it in the fact that the comparative worths of different kinds of knowledge have been as yet scarcely even discussed, much less discussed in a methodic way with definite results. Not only is it that no standard of relative values has yet been agreed upon; but the existence of such a standard has not been conceived in any clear manner. . . . It is true that in all circles we hear occasional remarks on the importance of this or the other order of information. . . . It is true also, that from time to time, we hear revived the standing controversy respecting the comparative merits of classics and mathematics. Not only however is this controversy carried on in an empirical manner, with no reference to an ascertained criterion; but the question is totally insignificant when compared with the general question of which it is a part. To suppose that deciding whether a mathematical or a classical education is best, in deciding what is a proper curriculum, is much the same thing as to suppose that the whole of dietetics lies in determining whether or not bread is more nutritive than potatoes.

The question which, we contend, is of such transcendent moment, is, not whether such or such knowledge is of worth, but what is its *relative* worth? . . .

In education then this is the question of questions, which it is high time we discussed in some methodic way. The first in importance though the last to be considered, is the problem,

how to decide among the conflicting claims of various subjects on our attention. Before there can be a rational curriculum, we must settle some things which it most concerns us to know: or to use a word of Bacon's, now unfortunately obsolete, we must determine the relative value of knowledges. . . . To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge; and the only rational mode of judging of any educational course is, to judge in what degree it discharges such function.

Human life is made up of different kinds of activity. Spencer classifies them thus in the order of their importance:

1. Those activities which directly minister to self-preservation;
2. Those activities which by securing the necessities of life, indirectly minister to self-preservation;
3. Those activities which have for their end the rearing and disciplining of offspring;
4. Those activities which are involved in the maintenance of proper social and political relations;
5. Those miscellaneous activities which make up the leisure part of life devoted to the gratification of the tastes and the feelings.

In all of these five parts and therefore, according to his division, in the whole field of education, Mr. Spencer found the schools doing nothing for the pupils. He found a remedy for this condition in the study of the sciences. Science, he maintains, in its broadest sense is the knowledge of most worth because it and it alone will prepare the student for participation in life in all its activities. The discussion in this part of the essay under these five heads is a fine piece of criticism on the giving to the pupil of the educational tools but not at the same time of the knowledge of how to use them. That is, getting ready to educate but not educating. It is of more value as a criticism of the education which does not prepare for life, than for its original purpose which was an argument in favor of science in the curriculum.

The following passages, taken one from under each of the five divisions stated above, should be read and considered by every one who is studying or is interested in the school system of our own day. The quotation with which I shall begin is not as forcible now as it was when it was written because we have advanced considerably since then in the way of making our school work prepare for life. The illustration is a comparison of the value of the classics as compared with physiology in training for self-preservation. He says:

Men who would blush if caught saying Iphigenia instead of Iphigenia, or would resent as an insult any imputation of ignorance respecting the labours of a fabled demi-god, show not the slightest shame in confession that they do not know where the Eustachian tubes are, what are the actions of the spinal cord, what is the normal rate of pulsation, or how the lungs are inflated. While anxious that their sons should be well up in the superstitions of two thousand years ago, they care not that they should be taught any thing about the structure and functions of their own bodies — nay, would even disapprove of such instruction. So overwhelming is the influence of established routine. So terribly in our education does the ornamental override the useful.

In regard to the next division of the educational field, he makes the following significant statement in regard to the gaining of a livelihood, or indirect self-preservation. He says:

Leaving out some very small classes, what are all men employed in? They are employed in the production, preparation and distribution of commodities. And on what does the production, preparation, and distribution of commodities depend? It depends on the use of methods fitted to the respective natures of these commodities; it depends on an adequate knowledge of their physical, chemical or vital properties as the case may be; that is, it depends on science. This order of knowledge, which is in great part ignored in our school courses, is the order of knowledge underlying the right performance of all those processes by which civilized life is made possible. Undeniable as this truth is, and thrust upon us as it is at every turn, there seems to be no living consciousness of it; its very familiarity makes it unregarded.

We come now to the third great division of the educational field. Training for the rearing and disciplining of offspring. He says it is a division for which there is no preparation whatever made. If by some strange chance not a vestige of us descended to the remote future save a pile of our school books or some college examination papers, we may imagine how puzzled an antiquary of the period would be on finding in them no indication that the learners were ever likely to be parents.

"This must have been the curriculum for their celebrities," we may fancy him concluding. "I perceive here an elaborate preparation for many things; especially for the reading the books of extinct nations and coexisting nations, from which indeed it seems clear that these people had very little that was worth reading in their own tongue; but I find no reference whatever to the bringing up of children. They could not have been so absurd as to omit all training for this the gravest of all responsibilities. Evidently then this was the school course for one of their monasteries."

He concludes that the schools do not train for parenthood and that a knowledge of science is the only thing that can so train a person.

In the field of training for citizenship, he condemns the method of teaching history which should prepare for citizenship, but does not. He says:

Scarcely any of the facts set down in our school histories and very few even of those contained in the more elaborate works written for adults, give any clue of the right principle of political action. . . . That which constitutes history, properly so-called, is in great part omitted from works on the subject. . . . The highest office which the historian can discharge, is that of so narrating the lives of nations as to furnish material for a comparative sociology. But social phenomena can be understood only when the laws of life are understood. Thus we see that for the regulation of this fourth division of human activity we are as before dependent on science.

His view of the fifth division, fine arts, belles-lettres, and "the accomplishments" generally, is, that they should be wholly subordinate to that knowledge and discipline in

which civilization rests. As they occupy the leisure part of life so they should occupy the leisure part of education. Again he asserts and attempts to prove that the thing that best fits one for the enjoyment of leisure is science.

His estimate of the value of science, and hence his declaration that it is the knowledge that is of most worth in all the divisions of human activity rests upon a misconception of the relation of the individual to the worth of different orders of facts or knowledges as a test of their true worth. This is shown most emphatically in his classification of knowledges. This classification is a weak point in his essay, yet it is the point upon which his whole argument rests. He says in this classification that the knowledges of science are of intrinsic value because they will always be true. The knowledges of Latin and Greek are of quasi-intrinsic value because of value only as long as our language lasts. That kind of information which usurps the name of history has only a conventional value which fashion assigns to it. The weakness of this classification lies in the fact that the problem of education is the problem of preparing individuals, as well as men in the mass, for life. As I have said, what is of value to one, may have no value of any sort to another. This is forcibly illustrated by Spencer's own valuation of the arts. An artist might justly take serious issue with him here; for the artist the things of art are not and never can be "Subordinate."

In considering the question of what knowledge is of most worth, the doctrine of the Grand Man is illuminating. From it we see the truth, that the Kingdom of Heaven is a kingdom of uses, where all should have a place who leave this world. This doctrine teaches us that heaven as the Lord sees it, is in a divinely human form, wherein societies of angels correspond to different organs of a human body, each with its special use or function. This world is a reflection of the other, and it too is one vast system of uses.

All education, direct and fortuitous, in this life and world, is a preparation not for time alone and a place in

the earthly system of use, but for eternity and for a place of use in this most perfect of all human organizations, the kingdom of the heavens. Each individual human soul has its use on earth and has its place in this kingdom of the Lord, prepared for him from the beginning. Each has his own peculiar work to do, no one else can do it for him. If he does not do it, it will not be done. As he does it well or ill, so it stands. This is the great charter of manhood and womanhood in the New Jerusalem, that God has given to each one something to do that no one else can do, and he wills that each shall do it as of himself. Thus man's work and his training instead of being for this life and ending with it, do, on the contrary, but begin here. The man goes on to a place where to live at all is to live from love to God and the Neighbor, and to express this love in deeds, loving, wise and useful, because the life of the Lord Himself is expressed in them.

As New-Church men, we have this distinctive heavenly knowledge, of the worth of education, to guide us, and because of it we would answer the question of what knowledge is of most worth in this way. It is the knowledge that enables a man to develop himself to his highest point of usefulness in this world; and complete living is a life of usefulness whose motives are unselfish and whose final outcome is salvation. Therefore the principle underlying New-Church education is to develop the individual to this highest point of usefulness not for what it may bring to him to reward him, but for what it may enable him to do for others. We recognize that there is a heavenly reason for individuality. Furthermore, the education and development of the race is progressive, and ever tending toward the coming down from God out of heaven of that Holy City, the New Jerusalem. The progress is from heaven to earth and back, up again, to heaven.

Swedenborg tells us that all the great world movements on earth are but the visible effects of great heavenly movements. The great movement and change in modern education of which Spencer's essay was in some sort the herald,

has applied itself to the study of Theology and the Bible. The effort and interest in the study of the Bible today, that is worth the name of study, is scientific effort and interest. We may be sure, in a general way, that the inner meaning of the flood of destructive criticism that is poured out on Orthodoxy has to do with the final judgment. In particular I feel safe in saying that its inner meaning has to do with the rejection of the man-made doctrines of the Old Church by the members of that organization, long since accomplished by those of them in heaven, and now being wrought out in the minds of men on earth.

Certain facts in the history of the development of doctrine in the Christian Church have become the common-places or axioms of Church History. Based upon these, and growing out of them, in fields of scholarship uninfluenced by any direct contact with or knowledge of the writings of Swedenborg, are the facts of recent developments of Bible study that are not yet seen by the many in their true light, not at all in their relation to the consummation of the age. For instance, from Church History, I refer to such facts as these: that the Christian Church developed the habit of formulating doctrine by church councils, doctrine that was held at last to be superior even to the revelation of Holy Writ. St. Augustine declared that he would not believe what he read in Scripture if it contradicted a promulgation of his Church. The revolt against this position and an opposite teaching came with the Reformation, which planted itself on the Bible, and destroyed, irremediably for its membership, the assurance that Church doctrine and revelation coincide. Protestant Orthodoxy followed with the reënforcing dogma of an infallible text of Holy Scripture. These are the familiar facts of Church History, now what are some of the facts of recent developments of Bible study? For these we might go to a multitude of sources. Let us turn not to the work of any layman, however able, nor to that of any person not fully accepted by Protestant Orthodoxy, but rather to the studies of a revered President of a great

Theological School. He teaches, quite as a matter of course, from the printed page, that Jehovah was a tribal God, greater than other tribal gods only in the minds of his tribe. He says that when Isaiah says, "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son," that the prophet plainly had no reference to a remote future but to an event then near at hand, so that the application of these words of the prophet to the birth of Jesus indicates an apparent misunderstanding of its true meaning by the Evangelist. Of the visit of the magi he says,

It is hardly conceivable that the advent of the Messiah should be first made known to men of a remote country and an alien faith rather than to His own people to whom salvation was first of all to be offered.

He says the account of the flight into Egypt may have sprung from a natural tendency often exemplified in myth-making epochs, to represent heroes as having escaped great dangers in their youth. The slaughter of the innocents is without historical foundation. And again, "The birth of John story is an imitation of the account of the birth of a son to Abraham." Again,

Luke's writing has preserved to us a Christian Mythology richer in subject matter than that of Matthew. The legend of the birth of Christ is altogether Jewish and national, embracing no conception of a spiritual world saviour. The poetical conception of a choir of angels, while adding much to the beauty of the legend, tends to confirm the impression made by previous portions of the narrative, that we are not standing on firm historical ground.

I give you these few quotations from his detailed study of the Gospel story, to illustrate how this man applies the principle of scientific study which he states in these words,

The scientific study of the New Testament is as objective a pursuit as the scientific study of outward nature and the laws which control the physical universe; only in the one case we come into relation with the symbols of human thought, while in the other we read in rock, plant and star, what was the thought of God when He spoke the world into life.

Along with present-day Protestant Orthodoxy there is also in the Old Church the very popular and pseudo-scientific study of the Scriptures called Christian Science. This science gives a key for the interpretation of the Scriptures. I would sum up these facts in the statement, that the Old Church, because of the new spirit in modern education, has been rejected by its own students both as to its declaration that Church Doctrine and Revelation coincide, and also as to its dogma of an infallible text. It has also rejected, in Christian Science, its teaching that each man has the ability to interpret Scripture only as his own unaided mental powers lead him.

Swedenborg tells us that the fig leaves with which Adam and Eve covered their nakedness represent the moral truths with which the Church, consummated in that day, veiled the things of their evil love and self-conceit. Again in the day of the consummation of this age, the fig leaf of moral truth appears, this time to replace the garments of Protestant Theology. I regret to add that there are many of these modern students of the Sacred Scriptures who have not the decency thus to cover their nakedness, but revel in intellectual conceits, that hold the Bible and the Divinity of Jesus Christ in contempt.

The New Church organization had, in the days of its early history, to meet and combat knowledge of and interest in the doctrines of Protestant Theology. Today this field is vacated by the leaders of our old-time opponents. The Book has been made an earthly book. The old doctrines are dead in the judgment of their logical defenders. It is a waste of time for the New Church to continue to oppose them. Their own adherents have disposed of them more effectually than any power that we could bring against them from outside could have done. There is however a new field, that these hard working, well trained, scientific students, who as yet have none of the light of the heavenly doctrines, have taken possession of in the place of the old field of religious dogma, and that is the field of textual study and criticism of the Bible. We know that Sweden-

borg entered this field years in advance of the higher critics. We know that in this field, our exegesis stands, as did our doctrine on the old battle ground, on the authority of the Lord Himself. We have before us today in the scientific, textual study of the Bible the great new field of use in the modern world that is waiting for us, and indeed longing for us to enter, without knowing what it waits for, nor what it longs for, nor dreaming of the heavenly possibilities at its hand of being all taught of God.

RUSSELL EATON.

MEDICAL EDUCATION AND THE NEW AGE.*

By J. P. SUTHERLAND, M. D.

THE year that has just passed doubtless will be looked upon as one of the most momentous in the history of mankind, a year of great awakening of the nations to the fact that mankind is a universal Brotherhood and not an aggregation of unrelated and independent communities. This year has been, as it were, the beginning of a New Age of enlightenment concerning the essentials of life, an enlightenment brought about through the sad and deplorable and cruel and wicked exigencies of the most devastating war humanity has known.

Let us now glance hurriedly at some aspects of the life of the world and humanity which though not strictly medical should be of interest to all students, seekers for truth and knowledge. It is impossible for us to live in scholastic retirement; to devote ourselves merely to the acquisition of medical knowledge and skill; to prepare ourselves only for a restricted professional life. We are human. We are part of an unhappy, struggling world, with our duties and responsibilities as individuals, as units in families, in communities, in our state, our country, in the world. We are parts of a whole, and whatever affects a part is necessarily reflected throughout the whole. It is our freely accepted duty for the time being to take advantage of every opportunity, to devote our best energies, our utmost mental and physical strength, our loyal and most faithful efforts, to perfecting our equipment in things medical, as much as in us lies, so that in due season we may carry healing and comfort to the suffering. But while this is to be our most

* From an address delivered by Dr. Sutherland, Dean of the Boston University School of Medicine, at the opening of the forty-fifth session of the school.

pressing and imperative duty we must not forget that so-called medical education is only a partial education. It is education along a very special line, and we must be careful not to translate all our experiences into medical terms, or interpret life from even the broadest medical viewpoint. From a very liberal non-academic but practical point of view, education is the training which fits one for life; not necessarily for the constricted, limited, selfish individual existence but for life in and of the world, for the useful co-operative intermingling with one's near and most distant neighbors. It is true the medical life is so comprehensive that sooner or later as one's experiences widen, all subjects, except possibly a few in abstract science, come within its horizon. Medical education, therefore, must be all inclusive. It may be claimed that life is too short to cover such a wide range of thought and study and activities. Unquestionably undergraduate medical life, even with a curriculum including approximately fifty subjects, is too short a time in which adequately to complete an education, that is, to fit oneself for a widely useful medical life. As a matter of fact, matriculation into a medical school means an initiation into a student life which terminates only with life itself, the four years course in the medical school being only a sort of primary grade, as it were, or the beginning. One who enters a medical school with any notion that his equipment is complete when he obtains his diploma of graduation must reconstruct his views and ideals, or else prove unworthy the profession he has entered.

The chief characteristic of modern times, that is our own days and the preceding century, is the growth and technical application of "Science." The Natural Sciences have generously revealed the secrets of the physical world to the searching and inquisitive eyes of man, and man's inventive genius has revelled in his increasing mastery over physical forces; in bridling the lightning, in leading the forces of heat and the attraction of gravitation captive, in harnessing the sun's rays to do his bidding. Man's knowl-

edge in what we call physics, in chemistry, in botany, zoology, physiology, embryology and histology, in geology, and in astronomy, has steadily and definitely increased in amount until it would seem as if there were no more worlds to conquer in things material. His utilization of this knowledge is shown in the growth of manufacturing and industrial pursuits, and in an increasing commerce. His knowledge and inventive genius are demonstrated in his construction of a bewildering variety of machinery, of steam, gas, and electrically driven engines; of cotton gin, of a Hoe press that prints, folds and binds in one process; of looms without number; of delicately adjusted microscopes, of powerful and wonderful telescopes; of talking and singing, adding and writing machines; of telegraphic and telephonic apparatus; in his construction of "sky-scrapers" and tunnels; in irrigation plants and agricultural devices for planting, tilling, reaping, etc. Man's ingenuity enables him to see micro-organisms of 1-40,000 of an inch in diameter, and the striations of Diatomaceæ 1-125,000 of an inch in diameter. His conceptions carry him far beyond the molecule to the atom and beyond the atom to the electron. At the other end of the scale, he measures the planets and outlines their courses, and penetrates the great universe to what to the average mind is an inconceivable distance. To learn that the outermost planet of our solar system is situated 2,743,000,000 of miles from our sun, and that its majestic march through its journey round the sun carries it through an orbit of 18,273,000,000 of miles is appalling, and yet man has measured greater distances, and his vision penetrates far beyond this distance, for the nearest fixed star is 21,000,000,000 of miles distant from this earth, and we are told that colossal Sirius, so often admired by us all, is 12,000,000 of miles in diameter (against our little earth of 8,000 miles) and 83,000,000,000,000 of miles away. But even Sirius becomes a near neighbor when we think that distant Arcturus is 154,000,000,000,000 of miles away. Beyond this even, though the eye of man aided by the most power-

ful telescope cannot penetrate, there are suns and earths and planets, for modern photography demonstrates the existence of stars otherwise unrecognizable.

Again man recognizes things which cannot be seen; the infra-red and ultra-violet rays are today demonstrable, and no one doubts the presence of an intangible something called the ether which interpenetrates all matter.

But man or modern science does not stop at these relatively gross material things. His researches carry him into psychological fields where by the recognized methods of science he is investigating imponderabilia;—such as hypnotism, telepathy, clairvoyance, double-personality and so-called “communications” with the discarnate (see transactions of the Society for Psychical Research and other recent literature).

And perhaps more marvelous than all this,—more wonderful than all the inventions utilized by man, more wonderful than the incredibly minute things referred to, or the inconceivable bulk and distances mentioned, is the fact that this knowledge, this stupendous familiarity with “science,” is all conceived by and stored away in a small mass of “gray matter” composed of a countable number of protoplasmic cells forming a part of what is called the Brain, an organ averaging in man approximately three pounds in weight.

I mention these things in order to emphasize the statement that today science rules the world. Even in medicine the bulk of our time and our best energies are devoted to the fundamental medical sciences, as they are called; of anatomy, histology, embryology, physiology, chemistry, bacteriology, pathology. These things claim and are worthy of much attention; they are among the absolutely essential things, but the therapeutic arts, the palliation, the prevention and the cure, are apt to be somewhat neglected. This is not true of surgery which, although a very mechanical art, is in its life-saving power the crowning achievement of medicine, and properly calls for a suitable apportionment of the student's time and energy.

The point to which I am anxious to call attention is this. Study of, progress in, and appreciation of the natural sciences is not a universal attribute. It is in fact in only a relatively small area of the earth's surface that science has its home, and only a minority of the earth's population that are its devotees. Prof. J. B. Baillie, of Aberdeen University, in a very convincing article in *The Hibbert Journal* for April written to show that "Science is one of the Humanities," makes the claim that "science is . . . but the consequence of a peculiar frame of mind which characterizes certain Western peoples. It is neither universal to humanity nor essential to all mankind." He says "it is dependent on climatic conditions and racial qualities"; that "its domicile seems as much restricted to specific localities as a botanical or an animal species." He further says:

The native habitat of the modern scientific spirit has been primarily the middle region of Europe, extending from the north-west to the south-east, and forming a kind of rough triangle whose apex lies in Italy, and whose base stretches from the southern shore of the Baltic Sea across Scandinavia to Scotland. . . . The mood of science finds its peculiar climate in this region. . . . The vast continents of Asia and Africa and non-Europeanized America have no scientific areas. The inhabitants of these non-scientific regions have indeed knowledge of their own, and a wisdom of their own; but it is not science. Asia and Africa, especially the former, are mainly religious and ethical in their frame of mind, not scientific. Science is a creation of the European West (p. 362, April issue of *The Hibbert Journal*).

It would seem as if there were nothing in this that any of us would seriously disagree with, and as members of the medical profession we recall the fact that only a very few short years ago the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning pronounced American educational institutions and methods, especially medical schools, almost hopelessly below par because they did not measure up to the standards and methods of the educational institutions of Teutonic Europe, the central home or special domain of the scientific spirit, towards which gravitated student life

from the four quarters of the earth, and from which radiated an influence felt in all sections of the world.

Lest I prejudice you in any way against Prof. Baillie let me quote his warning (p. 364).

Nor need we suppose that the scientific mind has all the advantages on its side, and the non-scientific all the disadvantages. . . . It is worth observing how the over-indulgence in the luxuries of science seems to destroy a man's balance of judgment in other realms of experience, practical and religious. So much is this recognized that the very name "Scientific expert" is almost a by-word for general intellectual incompetence.

Perhaps you already anticipate my object in turning your thoughts into this channel. It may be unwarranted to claim that the "modern scientific spirit" is primarily and essentially the main cause of the hate and bitterness, relentlessness and cruelty, suffering and unhappiness, devastation and misery, that find their main center in that "rough triangle" referred to by Prof. Baillie, and radiate thence to the ends of the world, but at all events, a strange coincidence is found here.

It would seem as if science had been weighed in the balance and found wanting in so far as the ideals of world-wide "Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité" or peace, prosperity and happiness, or freedom, justice and charity are concerned. But if science has failed so has religion. Yet a brief glance at, or a close scrutiny of, the history of mankind from the earliest recorded times shows unmistakably that the strongest motive force humanity has known has been religion. Vladimir Solovyov (a voluminous writer and one of the most remarkable thinkers Russia ever produced) taught that

Early in the history of the race the feeling of reverence was extended from the living to the dead and became the foundation of ancestor-worship; and as, in the course of its development, human reason gradually rises to the conception of one heavenly Father, the feeling of piety is transferred pre-eminently to him. . . . Reverence for something — whether it be human beings, deified forces of nature, abstract moral laws, or a living God — is inherent in every normal consciousness. . . .

President Wilson, quoted by Prof. H. B. Alexander of the University of Nebraska in an article on "America's Self-Revelation," says "I have not read history without observing that the greatest forces in the world, and the only permanent forces are the moral forces." (*Hibbert Journal*, Apr. 1917, p. 406.)

The highest morality, the noblest ethics, the religions of the past have all failed, however, *to bring the highest development* to mankind. Confucius taught a high morality. "What you do not want done to yourself do not do to others" is credited to him, but Confucianism has not advanced the cause of humanity. The same is true of the philosophical Brahminism which leaves one in abstractions. Buddhism, though wide-spread and poetical and full of imagination and influencing even today the lives of millions of people, fails when put to the test. Zoroastrianism once flourishing and influential is now confined to less than 100,000 Parsees, and is steadily dwindling under the force of Mohammedanism and modern civilization. Force, symbolized by the sword, did much for Islam, but Mohammed's teachings are inadequate for the world's progress. Greece and the Roman Empire had practically no religious influence on the world.

Christianity, as it has existed for the past sixteen centuries, has also failed equally with other religions; with philosophy, art (as music, painting, sculpture, poetry), history, literature, science, in bringing about a realization of the universal brotherhood which is destined to come in the days of reconstruction now begun. Most unfortunately Christianity has been so perverted by man that since the end of the second century of the Christian era *it has not yet had an opportunity* to bring its influence to bear upon mankind.

The Countess of Warwick in a strong article on "The New Religion" claims that the Established Church (Anglican) "is dead"; that the old religion has failed humanity in its present direst needs. The Dean of St. Paul's (London) in an article on "Survival and Immortality," a sub-

ject which, at the present time when such large numbers of the picked and most vigorous youth of the nations are meeting a sudden death on the field of battle, is foremost in men's minds, makes the discouraging statement

The Christian hope of immortality burns very dimly among us. Those who study the utterances of our religious guides must admit that it is so. References to the future life had, before the war, become rare even in the pulpit. The topic was mainly reserved for letters of condolence, and was then handled gingerly, as if it would not bear much pressure,

and quoting Plotinus, chiefly, and Spinoza, Martineau, Höffding, Münsterberg, Pringle-Pattison, Eucken and a few others of the same class, he has only a few philosophical platitudes to offer bereaved hearts.

The boasted civilization of recent centuries has proved no worthier than the religions, the philosophies, the arts, the sciences in furnishing the aid and comfort humanity needs, because of the artificiality of civilization. Prof. James Ward, in his Presidential Address to the Civic and Moral Education League (in London) May 23, 1917, succinctly says "People on all hands are realizing that the old civilization is passing away; and the new social reconstruction that will replace it is being everywhere anxiously awaited" (p. 534 *Hibbert Journal* for July, 1917).

I have made these references and quotations (and many more of the same sort might easily be made if time permitted) to bring before you the idea that a grand Reconstruction is in process of evolution; a reconstruction that will modify all relationships of mankind, of individual to individual, of nation to nation; the roseate dawn of a New Age characterized by a better civilization, a truer religion, a purer Christianity, can be seen above and beyond the smoke of battle, and it behooves us one and all, medical profession and laymen, to be awake, sensitive to the changes, receptive and willing to do our part in the reconstruction itself. We may well take for our mottoes "Awake, thou that sleepest" (Ephesians 5:14), "Awake, awake, put on thy strength" (Isaiah 52:1), "Gird up the

loins of your mind" (I Peter 1:13). Prepare for reconstruction.

Through what may seem a somewhat round-about journey, I have arrived at the lesson I should like to leave with you as a companion during your year's work.

The physician's life consists of much more than the administration of a pill or potion, the laying down of a few sanitary or dietetic rules, the making of a diagnosis, or the performance of an operation. The duties especially of the general practitioner bring him into the most intimate relations with his patients. At birth and at death, in joy and in sorrow, in tribulations of all sorts, his help is sought. To him come not only those physically, but those mentally, morally and spiritually sick; those whose hearts are broken; parents of delinquent children, the youth and the maid who have gone or been led astray; people in social, financial, domestic trouble; and to them all he is expected to listen sympathetically and intelligently and to give advice, encouragement, and parental or fraternal sympathy and comfort. To fill so many rôles the physician must be well equipped not only in the fundamental sciences and medical arts and technique, but in the exceptionally high qualities of heart and character that belong to the most sincere purposes and are founded deep in doctrine. In these days particularly, doctrine, that is a definitely recognized, true and reliable guiding principle, is needed in social life, in political life, in scientific life, in medical life and in religious life. In the purely medical life you will find yourselves provided by your instruction here with "doctrine," or a guiding principle. In other of life's relations, especially in cases of doubt, remember the words written by the Psalmist three thousand years ago, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path" (Ps. 119:105), and the promise given to mankind two thousand years ago, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." (Matt. 7:7; Luke 11:9).

J. P. SUTHERLAND.

THE PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALITY.

BY MISS ELAINE MARSHALL

INDIVIDUALITY is not a new problem in metaphysics but it is one which has had a slow, uneven treatment with much circular reasoning in its wake. Many writers seem to use *individual* and *individuality* almost interchangeably while principles of individuation are introduced now as rules and now as answering the question, to what does individuality belong. Because of this confusion, it will be necessary to study the definitions for all these three terms in order to learn what others have done with our problem. First of all stands *individual* which has significance for three groups of writers: the biologists who define it as a separate or independent organism, "an independent, separable being, capable of existing alone"¹; the students of ethics for whom an individual is contrasted with a corporation or social group or organization of any kind²; and the metaphysician to whose definitions we shall now direct our attention as they contain different aspects of the problem. Bradley says in a note, "The *this* signifies the point in which I am said to encounter reality."³ "According to McTaggart, individuals are differentiations of the Absolute."⁴ Then there is that group of thinkers who say, with the German, that the individual is unique.

Individuum bezeichnet ein Unteilbares, Einzelnes, ein Einzelwesen. Urspruenglich, faellt der Begriff des Individuums mit dem des Atoms zusammen. Dann wird er auf die menschliche Personlichkeit eingeschränkt. Leibniz und Wolf⁵ bezeichnen

¹ Baldwin, p. 534. (See Bibliography at end of article.)

² *Ibid.*

³ Bradley, p. 228.

⁴ Eisler, p. 569.

⁵ Sewall, p. 48.

ein Individuum als eine res omni modo determinata oder als ita determinata, ut ab allis omnibus distingui possit. Goethe schreibt an Lavater: Individuum est ineffabile, woraus ich eine Welt ableite.⁶

And this definition of Weisse also throws light upon the situation.

C. H. Weisse zählt das, 'Individuum zu den Kategorien des Masses. Es ist ein Unteilbares, aber nicht Teilloses. . . . bedingt durch sein Bestehen das Bestehen der Teile bedingt: ein dialektisch aufgehobenes Quantum.'⁷

The term *individual* is also sometimes used as equivalent to the self and it is Bradley who helps to boil down and extract the questions by an analysis like this one.

By one self we understand one experience. And this may either mean one for a supposed outside observer, or one for the consciousness of the self in question, the latter kind of unity being added to or apart from the first kind. And the self is not one unless within limits its quality is the same. Unless we view the individual from inside, it is quite impossible to find the limit within which change may not come and which yet is broad enough to embrace a real self. Then again, pieces of our life when we are asleep, or drugged, or otherwise distempered, are not represented.⁸

But our investigation is to learn, if possible, why we have individuals that are not selves or why there are selves that are not spoken of as individuals. In order to study this, we must use care to know that the principles of individuation apply to either individuals or to individuality and keep the two applications distinct in our minds.

We are, then, concerned with the problems that Royce states.

What sort of individuals does the real world contain? and How are they distinguished from one another and from the other types of reality which the universe has, if there are any such other types?⁹

⁶ Krauth, p. 441.

⁷ Eisler, p. 569.

⁸ Bradley, p. 82.

⁹ Conception of God, p. 217.

Other questions come up immediately, either as variations of the ones stated by Professor Royce or as new ones. They are, however, of Roycean origin, since he wrote the article which is here quoted from the Baldwin Dictionary.

In Psychology, it has been frequently asserted that individual objects are the immediate objects of our perceptive experience; so that it has been frequently maintained, as sufficiently defining the nature of an individual being that an individual is any object perceived by the mind as an external or as a real object. This makes individuality a character of beings derived from experience and irreducible to simpler ideas.¹⁰ . . . That the beings which are to be found in the world, whether inanimate objects or living beings, whether material or mental, are individuals, i.e., are distinct, singular, and unique is a matter of common report. But what constitutes individuality, or what is the principle of individuation has been a matter of controversy both within the realm of special science and from the point of view of logical and metaphysical definition.¹¹

It is clear that we need to study individuality rather as a character, or aspect of the self and to study individuals only in those aspects which particularly indicate this character. I have suggested before that the term, principle of individuation, has two meanings. They are both to be employed in this discussion, and after these meanings have once been stated, they are sufficiently independent to take care of themselves. One meaning is, the principle that determines to what individuality may properly be said to belong, and the other is the more general sense of a sign or mark of individuation which has been stated. "Individuality, like personal identity, belongs properly to intelligent and responsible beings,"¹² is an example of the first; and "Hæcceitas is that in virtue of which they say *this* and not *that*"¹³ is an example of the second use of the term which is the heart of the individuality problem.

If you have not already defined, apart from the fact of existence, what makes Sokrates and the stone, viewed in their

¹⁰ Baldwin, p. 534b.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Krauth, p. 251.

¹³ *Ibid.*

nature or essence, individuals, you cannot make the individuality clearer by merely saying, Sokrates (or the stone) exists. The concept of existence is not identical with the concept of individuality.¹⁴

Thus Royce guides us away from one pitfall of discussion and in saying later, "Individuality is not to be defined as distinctness or separation,"¹⁵ he steers us clear of another. "Individuality and Character are not the same. Individuality is that which Nature has made to be other than itself in the realm of mankind; character rests upon the customary work of man which often stands in opposition to (or, goes contrary to) Nature."¹⁶ This opposition to Nature will appear again when we discuss the Roycean purpose test and the universal suggestion of "customary" also makes this definition significant. In the Eisler Wörterbuch, we find a most satisfactory description of individuality, satisfactory because it is broad. "Individuality is the peculiarity, originality, similarity, sign (or symptom) and characteristic quality of, a unique creature, of a man, the individual character."¹⁷ Another intimation that we shall have to explain the relation of universals appears in the following: "According to Sully, individuality is the singular (or peculiar) aggregation of intellectual signs which one person gives impressing his own particular stamp."¹⁸ Our discussion focuses itself upon the question:

To what principle is the individuation of the world due? To the ultimate and brute fact of the segmentation of things? But this answer is impossible. For segmentation as a mere brute fact, is not identical with uniqueness. Color is a brute fact but it is not unique, individuation is not identical with the brute fact of segmentation. . . . To define such a problem, is already far more than half the answer. My result, so far, is that individuality, although it is known by and in the unity

¹⁴ Conception of God, p. 232.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

¹⁶ Krauth, p. 440.

¹⁷ Eisler, p. 565.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

of consciousness, is a category indefinable in purely theoretical terms.¹⁹

Herein we fully agree with Royce; but it is Bradley who gives us the key after Royce says we may have it, for Bradley shows us how to go to work.

If you take an essence which can change, it is not an essence at all; while, if you stand on anything more narrow, the self has disappeared. What is the essence of self which is never altered? . . . One self, doubtless can suffer change in which another would perish. On the other hand there are points at which he is not himself.²⁰

It is a legitimate step, then, to consider the empirical evidence of individuality as furnished by experience and analyze such experience for this purpose.

Before we can embark upon an intelligent analysis, it is imperative that we distinguish between the numerical and qualitative treatments of the question. Aristotle seems to have fully appreciated this difference but was unable to extricate himself from the logical interest which continually kept him swinging from the one to the other.

We could not suppose that there is a house besides the particular houses. . . . But are they many and different? This also is unreasonable. At the same time, how does the matter become each of the individuals, and how *is* the concrete thing these two elements? . . . But if there is a common element which is numerically one, and each of the principles is one, and the principles are not as in the case of perceptible things different for different things — there will be nothing besides the elements, for there is no difference of meaning between 'numerically one' and 'individual.'²¹

It would have been well if later investigators had heeded this warning of their master. Even more patent is the following from an earlier passage:

If unity *is* more of the nature of a principle, and the indivisible is one, and everything indivisible is so either in quantity or in species, and that which is so in species is prior to the

¹⁹ Conception of God, pp. 257, 258.

²⁰ Bradley, p. 80.

²¹ and ²² *Metaphysica*, p. 999b and 999a.

divisible, and genera are divisible into species (for man is not the genus of individual men), that which is predicated directly of the individuals will have the more unity.²³

To follow this up in modern philosophical language, I understand that Aristotle here says, the self or thing is the individual, the numerically one. What we wish to know is, the justification for individuality which is a qualitative term used in connection with each numerical one. What is it that makes us recognize the quality of individuality and mark it out from the universals of size, shape, mobility, and other characters of real objects? Baldwin's Dictionary puts the matter in another way.

Were two individuals in all respects precisely alike, so that whatever was predicated of one was true of the other, these two individuals would be ipso facto identical, and difference of individuality means difference of quality or character.²³

Bradley comes down to the specific instance when he deals with this matter and points a weak spot in many arguments, such as Royce's for the purpose principle.

We are warned, 'You must not say that two notes are the same note, or that two peas have the same color for that is to prove yourself incompetent to draw an elementary distinction'; and when we ask, are the notes and colors then really different, we hear that the likeness is the same.²⁴

We shall deal with the qualitative character.

Having established this distinction, let us proceed to the inquiry into *thisness* and *meness*, or that by reason of which we say *this* in connection with things and *me* in connection with persons; in other words, to the discussion of identity, since I understand the establishment of identity to be the empirical experience which most nearly approaches the experiences of individuality.

This-ness is the quality of inanimate, or not-self things to which we ascribe individuality. This is why we "identify" lost articles instead of individualizing them, but we

²³ Baldwin, p. 536a.

²⁴ Bradley.

may do the latter subjectively while we are going through the external process of identification. It is well known that Aristotle considered the body the sole principle of individuation and we will accept Royce's discussion of that point of interpretation since our interest is now in the validity of such a doctrine as adequate.

We assume that the *this* is, as such, an individual. But in fact the mere *this* is the barest of abstractions. It usually becomes an individual at any moment, by virtue of its relation to myself, the constantly presupposed central individual of daily life.²⁵

This is all true enough perhaps, but it is theory only; and when we examine our relations with things, various questions arise which make us turn to Bradley for an explanation. Let us investigate the case of the child who has broken her doll, adapting Royce's illustration of a similar point. In the identification of this object, the child recognizes brokenness to be a part of the possession's, the doll's, experience; and there is not, with the changed object still within the realm of perception, any doubt that the change belongs to that object. Thus it is futile, as Royce says, to offer a *whole* substitute while the object to which the experience of brokenness belongs as a culminating experience, as real to the child as the death of a friend is to an adult, is still present. It is also true that if the change is made before brokenness is known by the child to belong to the experience of the doll, that she will not question the identity of the substitute because, I say, brokenness is not a part of the experience of that object for the child. Royce uses the illustrations ²⁶as a proof of the affection or love of the child as being the reason for the rejecting of the substitute, but I think that the child realizes that the substitute lacks that very quality in the old which is the cause of sorrow, sympathy and affection; love causes the grief but it does not cause the judgment of rejection.²⁷ In the case of

²⁵ Conception of God, p. 256; also Hegel.

²⁶ Conception of God, p. 261.

²⁷ Soul, numbers 133, 306, 203.

lost articles, we have the complete experience (using experience to refer to the infinite number of classes to which our acquaintance with the thing has led us to ascribe it), and our anxiety is to discover that to which this experience formerly belonged. When several objects are presented, we do turn to the material signs of our former experience and apply to each such classes as we were wont to observe as its claim. If I lose my umbrella and see many to which I might apply my experiences, I call up the classes of short-handleness, blackness, worn-cordness, etc., of each. I employ my selective ability. Now, of course, if I should see one which filled the conditions of a class to which I *wished* mine had belonged and if I were addicted to the sin of deceiving myself and others, I might say, "That is my umbrella." In so claiming it, I should apply to it all the other characters of my own umbrella to which it did not, to my knowledge, belong. This is the principle of theft and possession, and it shows why it is easy to become in childhood so reckless of self-deceit as to so appropriate the possessions of others. It is the training the child receives which prevents such a catastrophe. The *this* cannot be claimed to be independent of the *that*.

In the *this*, there is something more than content, for by combining qualities indefinitely we are unable to arrive at the *this*. It has inconsistent aspects. It offers, from one aspect, an immediate, undivided experience, a whole in which the *that* and the *what* are felt as one.²⁸

Adopting this conclusion, it is plain that I take issue with Royce when he says,

The individual as such is an immediate object, but not an intelligible object. Nobody's knowing of Sokrates could be Sokrates, or even another case of the same man. Hence, in order to save the reality of the individual, you have to exclude some aspect of him from any possible intelligible knowledge. And this aspect is precisely his individuality as Sokrates.²⁹

²⁸ Bradley, p. 230.

²⁹ Conception of God, p. 243.

Royce fails to bring out the fact that rejection is a property of selective judgment and appears in consciousness conditioned by intellectual activity instead of being conditioned by the passive affections. To put it in another way, rejection is here directly induced by the child's knowledge or judgment and not from the affection or emotion which is sorrow and passive. I am not here considering rejection as an expression of the instinct of repulsion,³⁰ because this new doll has all the attributes (save the one of brokenness) which would normally excite the impulse of approach³¹ and not of repulsion. It is because she uses her intelligence or knowledge of the character of brokenness and associates it with the doll that was, which makes her refuse even a more approachable substitute. Consequently the rejection is treated as a judgment and not as an "affection of unpleasantness" belonging to the instinct of repulsion. This difference is made more vivid by reminding ourselves that no one who loved the child would consider offering her a snake or a toad as a substitute for her doll. Such an act would destroy the developing tendency to retain relevant states of mind. In New-Church terms we would say that we would thereby lower the plane from the natural rational, to the corporeal which is the temple of heredity and therefore of instincts. This sudden descent from one plane to another is inherently revolting and for this reason anticlimax and pun are dangerous forms of wit. But to return to our comment on Royce, I grant that if he had said that the individual is not a *merely* intelligible object, his first sentence would stand approved, but such a modification seems incompatible with the remaining sentences of the quotation. The question of whether anyone's knowing of Sokrates is Sokrates, is most irrelevant.

But because Royce fails us at this point, let us not abandon his theory entirely. After all, "The *mine* is my existence taken as an immediate fact, as an integral whole of

³⁰ McDougall, p. 55.

³¹ Calkins, p. 92.

psychological elements which simply are." ³² Our care need not be whether or not I am an individual, but that others may feel, in the course of social relations, the reality of the fact. Here Royce is more to the point. He pounces upon purpose as the principle of the individuation of people as unique. For the space of time that one spends in reading his discussion, one feels that purpose is entirely adequate, but when we go to cash a cheque in a strange place we find that the purpose we express only fixes us in the class of cheque-passers and does not help, but hinders the cause. The situation is the exact reverse of the lost article. There we had the classes to help us choose; here we must prove that we are more than a mere member of the class of cheque-passers. We have put ourselves into a class with which the teller is entirely familiar and then he demands that we exhibit evidence of some of our other classifications in order that he may find that to some one class any future case of cheque-passer may refuse to respond. Bradley puts the situation thus:

Personal identity is mainly a matter of degree. The question has a meaning if confined to certain aspects of the self, though even here it may be made definite in each case only by the arbitrary selection of point of view.³³

What classes does the teller ask us to respond to as a guide to our selection? Often he inspects our possessions including personal appearance, sometimes he asks us to write our name and by experts this is often taken as an entirely satisfactory classification; speech also is often noted especially when there is a marked peculiarity. Then there is the bearing and effect which a person has, as capable of arousing pleasure or non-pleasure or pain. But the most common question of all is, "Are you acquainted with anyone here?" Acquaintance, then, is an index to identity. The list becomes more and more indefinite or comprehensive as to the character of the classifications.

If it proved that the individuals had their significant separation as ethical beings, would it not, when it existed involve

³² Bradley, p. 237.

³³ Bradley, p. 85.

their mutual isolation as brute facts? In that case all the variety, all the individuation, all the mutual independence, that ethical theory demanded might be perfectly consistent with, and even essentially be implied by that very unity of consciousness in which and by virtue of which the individuals are real.³⁴

It is to be remembered, however, that the inquiry into the establishment of *identity* is not necessarily establishing individuality, but assuming it. The teller does not doubt that you are an individual, but he wants to know which, out of thousands of individuals, you are. The matter of vulnerability as it appeared in the case of the doll is often cited in some form for purposes of individuality, and death is certainly a part of people's experience from the point of view of those left behind. One twin is often accounted an individual beside the other because he or she is defective or vulnerable in some sense in which the other is not. That is, contrast is used as a principle of individuation. But double personality does not concern us beyond the fact that this person's experience may be considered as complete only when it is conceived as partaking of doubleness, of duplicity, contrast, or inconsistent motives balancing each other in time. This person's individuality is the balance instead of the unified and subordinated contrast which marks individuality in normal people. This is, then, the prime mark of individuality in the case of double personality and is named under the index of vulnerability.³⁵

We must not ignore in this discussion a most prevalent idea that time and space are adequate principles of individuation.³⁶ For the purpose of our present discussion and from its point of view, time and space are principles of numerical individuation and may serve in many cases as helpful preliminaries in fixing the qualitative classes. I have accepted Royce's criticism on this point as wholly

³⁴ Conception of God, p. 221.

³⁵ Soul, 156.

³⁶ Baldwin, p. 536a.

justifiable. It is, "that what it has identified is always a collection of universal types, never an individual."³⁷

Universals, as such, must not be thrown aside from our question, however. We noted with Royce that,

With the young child the background of the universe is not yet the individual, but the unrecognizably confused many, the relatively undifferentiated mass of changing contents, which the child does not make out, and does not know except as the background of the universals that he does know.³⁸

Aristotle recognized this too.³⁹ In fact universals have been seen to play a large part even in the everyday experience of identity and individuality, and we consider Hegel at least justified in his theory that, "the individual is the unity of the universal and the particular"⁴⁰ (understanding by unity, the transcended). On the other hand, we must not lose our perspective; "individuation is not due to a process that merely specifies universal types"⁴¹ Royce is entirely right there and serves to check up Bradley but he leaves it to us to discover *why* both the universal and the particular must be given a fair chance. Professor Royce goes just so far and then stops because the affective element holds his interest. He is a victim of the selective process. He thus recognizes, nevertheless, that very process.

The world in its unity is an individual whole, such that no other could take its place as an expression of this one purpose. Our idea of individuality comes to our finite consciousness, therefore, rather on the selective side of this consciousness than upon the side of its present fulfilment. It is not so much what I already know about an individual, as what my affections determine to regard as unique in the value of my object, the uniqueness of the object in question. . . . Now the finite process, whereby our own consciousness passes from an indeterminate to a relatively determinate state of purpose, of intention, of seeking for contents, is known to us in its psychological

³⁷ Conception of God, pp. 251 and 253.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 260.

³⁹ *Metaphysica.* p. 999a.

⁴⁰ Baldwin, p. 536a.

⁴¹ Conception of God, p. 207.

manifestations as a process of Selective Attention growing more and more definite as it proceeds.⁴²

It seems quite appropriate to return with Royce to our old friend Sokrates, the moral individual. As to him, he is and can be metaphysically differentiated and individuated only by the fact, if it is a fact,

that the Absolute finds in him the fulfilment of an exclusive interest, such as, in this individual world, nobody else can, or from God's point of view, nobody else *shall* fulfil.⁴³

In the *World and the Individual*, he says the same thing, almost. "The individual is, primarily, the object and expression of an exclusive interest, of a determinate selection."⁴⁴ But what shall we say of the correctness of that famous statement of James, "There is no property ABSOLUTELY essential to any one thing."⁴⁵ May it not be as Royce says, that "Thus the will individuates according to its own needs."⁴⁶ This seems entirely plausible, especially as one takes into account such a situation as this. In the selection of individuals we may say, "She plays the piano. We need piano-players. Therefore we need her." It is obvious that the girl's membership in the class piano-players is the basis of the selection; we choose members of a chosen class. She could not establish her individuality for us by playing the piano. Her individuality would come by means of the knowledge that she belongs to other classes too. I wonder if it was a similar line of thought which led Bradley to say, "The *this* is unique really so far as it is a member in a series, and so far as that series is taken as distinct from all others."⁴⁷ I should supply the word regardless of, or ignoring, for distinct, but otherwise his conclusion seems to be mine. Thus broadly defining the principle of individuation, it seems not a difficulty in our way to think of a

⁴² *World and Individual*, pp. 458, 448.

⁴³ *Conception of God*, p. 267.

⁴⁴ *World and Individual*, p. 460.

⁴⁵ James, Vol. II., p. 333.

⁴⁶ *Conception of God*, p. 271.

⁴⁷ Bradley, p. 229.

community as an individual (cf. Heaven and Hell, n. 41) or as partaking of individuality. Here Royce's pet is a decided advantage. The same contents may form a part of very various individuals, in so far as the same contents may be the object of various individuating interests, each one of which excludes all the other objects while all refer to the same contents. It is in this sense that even in our ordinary experience different wills can individuate in different ways the same object, "as many worshippers enjoy the same church, which is an individual in very different senses for all of them."⁴⁸ This explanation is satisfactory and final for the question of whether or not a community may be said to have individuality.

What Royce has failed to do in the way of solving the problem seems to be due to the fact that he tries to solve two problems at once: 1. What does individuality belong to? 2. Can it belong to God? This ambiguity makes him oblivious of the fact that the purpose of an individual may be what calls his individuality into question, and that the purpose of the community is what absorbs the purposes of the community's members and obscures them as individual purposes just to the degree in which those members partake of the community-purpose.

I have not considered the activity or the demeanor of a person at great length because it was so closely bound up with my conclusion. Royce barely touches upon it when he says,

As against this view, it has been maintained that the direct object of our perceptual experience is always a series or complex of definable or indefinable qualities, characters, relations and behaviours of objects.⁴⁹

I saw in *Life* about March, 1917, the picture that had for its title "The Moving Picture Actor," who is told he must be identified. He was pictured as going through his capers as an indication that he believed that his behavior would prove his most certain means of identification. His is the

⁴⁸ Conception of God, p. 270.

⁴⁹ Baldwin, p. 534b.

case of one who knew to what class to turn when he found he must extricate himself from the class that was too familiar to the bank teller. If we apply this same principle to psychological activity, Royce's statement that "I can only assert my finite self by actively transforming myself; so that I actually obey, in some measure even when I rebel,"⁵⁰ and again that "Each finite Self expresses itself in a series of deeds; is itself, in some measure and in some aspect, however slight, free so that the individuality of every act sets a limit to the possibility of the casual explanation of this act by an external observer,"⁵¹ make activity or purpose take on a new aspect. Nevertheless this aspect ignores the fact that persons obsessed by a single purpose are said to have *lost* their individuality. Bradley brings this point out but Royce fails to meet it.

In conclusion, I have found that our purpose places us in a given class, then we rise out of, or transcend, that class in a way which does not destroy, but makes that class a useful category since we are not swallowed up by it. The person who is obsessed by an idea or purpose is said to lose his individuality and yet he has a most definite and real interest. In identifying ourselves, we show that we are capable of responding to other classes, and of transcending them too if they in turn are selected by the one whom we wish to individuate us. Individuality is numerically, necessarily, one, but qualitatively, it has, or rather requires, response to an infinite number of qualitative changes of purpose as these are indicated by time, space, and the many, in such a way that, selecting a given purpose, that purpose becomes dynamic only through our ability to convince the selector of that purpose that it is subject to the modifications which its satisfaction must necessarily bring about. In short, we can lay claim to individuality only when we indicate by our demeanor that this purpose will, at its satisfaction, fall normally into line with my other purposes. So long as this power to transcend

⁵⁰ *World and Individual*, p. 350.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

and absorb the realization of a purpose lasts, bodily changes, time, space and social relations may act and react as they will and still individuality will belong to the man and to things in their relation to him. My individuality, that is, myself in respect to the character of individuality, is actually the great aggregate of experience which has thus transcended purposes under just these conditions. But so far as our finite knowledge is concerned, individuality is limited by a disregard of certain of my transcended purposes and a setting up, by each one of us, some one of our friends' purposes by which we say he shall, or does, establish his claim to individuality, by transcending that purpose. Individuality as a reality in experience is thus seen to be due to a teleological selection for the finite mind which at the same time recognizes the universal, the complete experience, as the genuine principle of individuation.

ELAINE MARSHALL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aristotle, *Metaphysica*, The Works of Aristotle Translated into English. Vol. VIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.
2. Baldwin, J. M., Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, Vol. I. New York, Macmillan Co., 1901, pp. 534-539a.
3. Bradley, F. H., Appearance and Reality, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1908. 3d revised edition.
4. Calkins, M. W., First Book in Psychology, 4th revised edition. New York: Macmillan Co., 1914.
5. Calkins, M. W., Persistent Problems of Philosophy. 3d revised edition. New York: Macmillan Co., 1912.
6. Eisler, Rudolf, Woerterbuch der Philosophischer Begriffe, 3d revised edition. Vol. I. Berlin: Ernst Mittler & Son, 1910.
7. Hegel, Phenomenology of Spirit, translated by J. B. Baillie. 1910.
8. James, William, The Principles of Psychology. Vol. II. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1893.

9. Krauth, Chas. P., *A Vocabulary of the Philosophical Sciences*. New York: Sheldon & Co., 1879, pp. 250-252, 441.
10. McDougall, *Social Psychology*, 6th edition. Boston: John W. Luce Co., 1912.
11. Royce, J., *Conception of God. Supplementary Essay*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1897.
12. Royce, J., *World and Individual, First Series*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1908.
13. Sewall, Frank, *Swedenborg and Modern Idealism*. London: James Speirs, 1902.
14. Swedenborg, Emanuel, *Soul, or Rational Psychology*, translated by Frank Sewall, 3d revised edition. New York: New Church Press, 1887.

THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW IDEA OF GOD.*

BY THE REV. WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

TO one man, anyway, the skies over religion can hardly grow pitch black. He is the man who is convinced, by the announcement of it in the works of its herald, Swedenborg, of the Lord's Second Coming in these days. He is by conviction bound to be the most optimistic man about the more immediate fortunes of men's spiritual life. There is a revival of that life going forward, and he cannot but behold its initial burst of light, the gleams of its progress. In the thick weather of theological unrest, and in the heavy storms of political and industrial change, he will watch the lightning of spiritual alteration in human society. In the noise of the thunder he thinks he hears the crashing of truth which is precipitated in conflict. To his mind it is the God of glory that thunders; the Lord sits King at the flood; and in the Divine Temple he sees whole new areas of life arrive, crying, "Glory!" The storm of a colossal war does not obliterate the light of the morning star which the Lord has set in the world's heavens to point it to a higher spiritual life; the storm itself is streaked with the rays of a world dawn. The New-Churchman cannot lose sight in the clouds of the light of Him Who has come in them for a fact with glory and unwonted power.

Sometimes, never doubting he stands himself in a blaze of light, and impatient for noon-day everywhere, he has a poor opinion of the daybreak. He does not see the dawn as advanced as it is. And sometimes, surely, he has quite mistaken the nature of the occurrence, to begin with. Ac-

* *God, the Invisible King.* By H. G. WELLS. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1917. xvii, 174 pp., 12mo. \$1.25 net.

Do We Need a New Idea of God? By EDMUND H. REEMAN. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs Co. 215 pp., 12mo. \$1.00 net.

customed to cast Christian idea and life into a firm formula, and to identify it by creed, he is prone to look for formal revisions of creeds, for official adoption of new theologies, wherever it is asserted the spiritual life revives. He sees none of the uncrystallized changes; he passes over non-ecclesiastical bodies and movements—yet may not the reality of the new life be there? Knowing that the light to lead the revival has its ordained lamp in the formulations of the theological works of Swedenborg, he is hardly persuaded that there is any progress until he sees every other man discarding his own receptacle of light and acceding to the same formulation. Is this acclaiming the light? Is it confidence in the diffused intenser light now of the sun of the world of men's spirits? Is it standing upon the statement of those very works? "Last Judgment," n. 73, assuring the reader of the continuance, at the Second Coming, of the same world in respect of "external form," that is, of like national and civic activity, of familiar church organizations, adds that "their doctrines will be taught as before." The mere formulations persist, however re-interpretation may alter their sense. But a spirit of inquiry in things spiritual would spring up, and a light be vouchsafed it, in re-examination, for better understanding, of Christianity's truth. Could a statement be truer to the event? The change is proceeding in this way. In the spiritual life reviving and deepening under the impulsion of the Lord in His Second Coming we have not just a church movement, nor at once anyway a process of doctrinal reformulation, but a wide movement of spiritual enlightenment and of fresh and more genuine religious impulse. We need to descry its pervasive tendencies, to detect its directing truths, unshaped though these may be, and to appreciate its changed motive, though this may be hardly self-conscious, if we would see the dawn of the new religious day as hopeful and extensive as it is.

Certainly, in the conviction of us all, the Second Coming is the enlightenment of this world from the spiritual world, and the impulsion of it thence to fuller living of the Christian life. Universally present in our natural existence, the

world of the spirit, advanced by a last judgment into a more genuine Christianity, inspires to the like advance here everywhere. Let into a nearer and larger experience of the life that is from God the Lord, new trends break from the altered spiritual world into our natural thought and existence. Why should we not have faith that this world-wide influx is fact? As an event the Second Coming was the announcement of this making of Christianity genuine and the publication of its doctrines; but as a process it is progressively realized in the life that men actually live. Its impulsions appear especially in the outermost reaches of life, in our workday world, in economics, in politics, in the world's self-government, in the growth of "social conscience" and of national and international conscience, supremely; certainly not just in disturbed church-life, nor chiefly in theological unsettlement and reconstruction. The life of the Divine is moving to occupy as its own the areas of our natural existence; the Lord reveals Himself to this age of apocalyptic promise as the "Divine Natural."

The two books we are noticing—Mr. Wells's "God, the Invisible King," and "Do We Need a New Idea of God?" by Edmund H. Reeman—we notice for what seems to be their touch with the new religious day.

The one of these authors, Mr. Wells, is full of rapt reference to "a stirring and a movement" (p. 157) in the world of religion. It is in his view a world dawn (*ibid.*). Its "realizations" are "still uncertain and incomplete" (*ibid.*); but "there are many signs that the revival is coming very swiftly, it may be coming as swiftly as the morning comes after a tropical night. It may seem at present as though nothing much were happening, except for the fact that the old familiar constellations of theology have become a little pallid, and lost something of their multitude of points. The deep stillness of the late night is broken by a stirring; and the morning star of creedless faith, the last and brightest of the stars, the star that owes its light to the coming sun, is in the sky" (*ibid.*). The religion that is shaping is converged to in all lands (pp. 158,

seqq.). Mr. Wells writes down not just his own convictions as a party to this change, but reports the ideas upon God, and life, and man, which those "belonging to the new religion" have come to cherish (pp. 4, 171). His book "is an account rendered. It is a statement and a record, not a theory. There is nothing in [it] that has been invented and constructed by the writer; I have been but scribe to the spirit of my own generation." It is a report after survey from a man with the needed imaginative vision and power of graphic relation. "The new religion" breaks with traditional doctrinal Christianity, so much so that Mr. Wells does not call it Christianity at all—not without reason! The consummation of the Christian era and the inauguration of a new spiritual life, the avowal of a "late night" and a new dawn, is no common avowal, anyway; nor a readily accepted proposition.

Mr. Reeman has quite as large a conception of the change in Christianity. The desiccation of the traditional theology, the lack of appeal in the customary presentation of Christianity, the obsolescence, particularly of the traditional idea of God,—upon these he is clear and trenchant; and there is very real to him the indefinite movement of spiritual inquiry, thought, and life, equipped, he argues, with a higher ethics than the church itself, and making its way to certain fresh conclusions about God and man and life, which is Mr. Wells's "stirring and movement." Reeman agrees with Wells that of this reviving spiritual life and thought the churches are not the exponents, to their loss and ultimate grief. To both writers the transition, often so-called, much in the mind of observers, is critical, radical, the emergence of a new day.

Both books are engaged chiefly with the idea of God which the new day is bringing with it; and it is upon this point that we notice them mainly.

But before proceeding with the conception of God put forward in the two books, may I ask the reader to cast an eye with me over a distinction in our idea of God which is precisely made in those doctrines of which their scribe

said they were for a New Church? It is a practically influential distinction, one that has proved so in the course of theological thought, and in the history of ecclesiastical action, even in the determination of national destinies. Christian thought has too little realized it. Indeed, Christianity was not very old when God as Man and as brought by Christ within the range of human thought and feeling was rather facilely philosophised out of nearness to men, and God infinite and unknown left. No? Where, save in the place thus made vacant, did Roman Catholicism find room for a Vicar? And what else than weaken God's purchase in human life and history did doctrinal Christianity do generally, when it shifted its interest from the historical Jesus to the eternal Word con-substantial with the Father? And of late, in the foreground thus emptied of God in Christ, has not the German Imperial Government been able to instate the war-god of the Jews, the war-god of Scandinavian mythology? God as Man is God in the foreground of human thought and action. Empty the foreground of Him, and there reigns then no compelling Deity, visible to thought, tangible to feeling, having relations with us, issuing His veritable commissions to us. The idea of God is then "determined to nothing." Usurpation is invited. Hidden Deity writes no history. There is no more consequential distinction of which the idea of God is capable, than that between the Divine itself and the Divine Human, in the language of the doctrines.

Men have never known the Divine itself. Never have men worshipped God in this aspect. Always has the Son Who is in the bosom of the Father declared Him. God uttered, God graciously entering upon human thought and affection, God winning embodiment in a heavenly society from the human race and in a redeemed earthly society, the world has known; and in Him the whole God, truly; but the Divine itself, the very Being of existing beings and things, never has fallen within the apprehension of men, never can. No one has elaborated the significance of the Scriptural expressions of this truth more forcefully than Swedenborg,

in the pursuit of his mission to the reviving spiritual life of men on this planet.

The human mind itself, even when in the highest degree analytical and exalted, is finite; and its finiteness is inseparable from it; and or this reason the human mind is wholly incapable of seeing the infinity of God as it is in itself, thus of seeing God; although it can from behind see God obscurely . . . in the visible things of the world, and in the perceptible things of the Word. (True Christian Religion, n. 28.)

No man in the whole world has seen Jehovah. . . . The Infinite itself, which is over all the heavens, and above the inmosts with man, cannot be made manifest, except through the Divine Human which is only in the Lord. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1990.)

The Divine which is above the heavens . . . cannot fall into human minds, and not even into angelic minds, because it is infinite. (*Ibid.*, n. 9946.)

The Divine itself cannot be worshipped, because it cannot be approached, either by faith or by love, being above every idea, according to the Lord's words, Jno. i: 18 and v: 37. (*Ibid.*, n. 6887.)

It may be also noted for the sake of some things to follow, that the Divine itself does not fall within the range of moral and spiritual struggle either, which is finite destiny. (*Ibid.*, n. 2795(2))

The correlative truth Swedenborg has stated no less comprehensively. God as He has been known, worshipped, influentially approached, has been and always will be the Divine distinguishable from the Divine itself; the Divine abroad, rather, upon the heart and minds of men, the Divine appearing under finite measure to the finite man. This is bound to be so. It is a mistake to regard the Divine under this aspect as a "Person," meaning the term in the impossible tri-theistic sense of a separate individual; or on the other hand to think that it is not God Himself personally in human life; but distinguishably different being from the Divine itself is this Divine within the range of human conception and of embodiment in aspiration and deed. This Swedenborg terms the "Human Essence" of God, the "Divine Human."

The Infinite itself, which is over all the heavens, and above the inmosts with man, cannot be made manifest, except through the Divine Human which is only in the Lord. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 1990.)

The Infinite Esse . . . could in no way be manifested to man except through the Human Essence, thus through the Lord. (*Ibid.*)

That which is from the Divine itself cannot flow in immediately with any angel, because it is infinite, but only mediately, through the Lord's Divine Human . . . This also was from eternity. (*Ibid.*, n. 4724.)

This Divine it is that achieved perfect embodiment in human life in Christ.

This Divine, or this of Jehovah in heaven, is the Lord from eternity. The same also the Lord took upon Him when He glorified or made divine the human in Himself. (*Arcana Cœlestia*, n. 5110 (3))

In all men else it is only struggling, and always will be only struggling towards perfect embodiment. To this end it wages world-wide moral warfare. It fights every moral and spiritual battle in which any man, any nation, the race engages.

From the human He could fight against the hells; but not from the Divine without the human. (*Ibid.*, n. 10659 (3).)

From Divine power in the human. . . . He afterwards alone fights and conquers for heaven and the church, thus for the universal race to eternity. (*Ibid.*, n. 9715 (7).)

The God known in heaven and on earth is the God of this struggle, a God who redeems by moral combat.

Mr. Wells's book is a vigorous general appreciation and application of this double truth and the distinction in it. In the matter of God the Creator Mr. Wells is agnostic (xii); "he declares that we do not know, and perhaps cannot know in any comprehensible terms, the relation of the Veiled Being to that living reality in our lives who is, in his terminology, the true God" (*ibid.*). God known is God the Redeemer, in the matter of whom he has "entire faith" (xii). With Him, too, the God of the heart,

as distinguished from the inscrutable Being of the Universe, "the reality of religion deals wholly and exclusively" (xiv). "For the purposes of human relationship," he says, "it is impossible to deny that God presents Himself as finite, as struggling and taking a part against evil" (p. xiv). He is not omnipotent in the old sense of able to blot evil out at any time in any way; His method for its abolition is slow moral enlightenment and struggle, in the course of which evil is uncovered and mastered. Hence he says (p. 5) that "perhaps the most fundamental difference between this new faith and any recognized form of Christianity is that, knowingly or unknowingly, it worships *a finite God*." "The fact that God is *finite* is one upon which those who think clearly among the new believers are very insistent. He is, above everything else, a personality, and to be a personality is to have characteristics, to be limited by characteristics; he is a Being, not us, but dealing with us and through us; he has an aim, and that means he has a past and a future; he is within time and not outside it. And they point out that this is really what every one who prays sincerely to God or gets help from God, feels and believes" (pp. 6, 7). "This is the God it has always been in your nature to apprehend" (p. 137). "God faces the blackness of the Unknown and the blind joys and confusions and cruelties of life, as one who leads mankind through a dark jungle to a great conquest. He brings mankind not rest but a sword" (p. 96). The accepted figure of Jesus is not, then, in the tone of the new worship (p. 101). "It is not by suffering that God conquers death, but by fighting. Incidentally our God dies a million deaths, but the thing that matters is not the deaths but the immortality. It may be that he cannot escape in this person or that person being nailed to a cross or being chained to be torn by vultures on a rock. These may be necessary sufferings, like hunger and thirst in a campaign; they do not in themselves bring victory. They may be necessary, but they are not glorious. . . . Our crucifix, if you must have a crucifix, would show God with a hand or a foot

already torn away from its nail, and with eyes not down-cast but resolute against the sky; a face without pain, pain lost and forgotten in the surpassing glory of the struggle and the inflexible will to live and prevail" (pp. 101, 102). From an appreciation of God's struggle with evil and every form of death we go on to throw ourselves with all our might and study into the same struggle (pp. 104, 105). See the "true God," and you hear a mandate to engage with Him in His high enterprise. It is a determinate idea of God we have here, an idea determined into the energies of man, and his actual life. And there follows in Wells a manual of what we might after Swedenborg call charity in this and that occupation, and a forceful statement how such a God must needs be enthroned in all governments, behind any visible ruler, in the management of the world's concerns. It is an idea of God determinate enough for Wells to describe the likeness of God so conceived—He is Courage, and He is Person, in fact, Body, and He is Youth, and He is Love (Chap. iii.). Sometimes the language is startling—"finite God" especially so; and "young and energetic Prince." Yet is it not true that "the infinite cannot be conjoined with what is finite, thus not with the angels of heaven, except by the putting on of some finite," and that this Infinite with the somewhat finite is the only known God? (*Arcana Cœlestia*, 8760 (2).) And that God is Youth—why start at that? The known God, the Divine Human it is that makes heaven, and to grow old in heaven is to grow young. Naturally it is in the vivid language of the novelist that Mr. Wells draws the likeness of God which those begin to behold who are parties to the "stir and movement" of which his book is a record.

Mr. Reeman inquiringly leads his reader to the same conception, essentially, of God thus heartily and mightily struggling in the development of human life—again as that conception is forming in the minds and aspirations of many people, to whom the older thought of God means little (p. 776). His presentation is without the verve and the emotional glow of Mr. Wells's discussion. He pursues an

angle in his discussion belied by Mr. Wells's very title, for Mr. Reeman's effort is to penetrate the false connotations of the monarchic thought of God, and to conceive Him up to the nearer insights of the fuller, democratic development of our life, beholding Him then not as the remote and autocratic monarch of much theology but the great Democrat of our actual life, ruling His people by their conscientious suffrage, engaging for common ends with them in a vast moral struggle, the "life-force" (here again using a term which Mr. Wells eschews) of all mental, moral and spiritual development. God is in this profounder struggle of life "fighting to win larger victories, toiling to bring into being a larger right than the world has ever yet known, and . . . *He needs us* and all the help that we can give to the effort." So the same high summons to men to fight wrong and evil issues from this conception of God as we saw result from Mr. Wells's delineation of the new God-thought—a summons which, in the most stimulating chapter in the book ("Need for a New Religious Appeal"), Mr. Reeman declares the churches lamentably fail to sound.

To the average person to-day religion, as presented by the churches, appears a comparatively cheap and easy thing that makes little or no demand upon the heroic qualities or the latent fighting instincts that reside in man and that from time to time surge up within us all. I do not put this forth as a mere assertion. It is a fact, I believe, that is capable of very easy demonstration. Take any American city as an example. Would it not be an exceedingly difficult matter for any ordinarily intelligent outsider coming to a new city to say just how much religion means to its average church-goer, or to determine with any degree of accuracy exactly what religion means to the average church-goer?

On the face of things it can certainly be said that religion does not appear to mean anything very strenuous or exacting. What real demand does the average church to-day make upon its individual members? Does it hold up before its members anything that can be said to constitute a serious challenge? (Pp. 158, 159.)

The very idea of God presented levels no challenge. The Deity of hymn, and creed, and sermon, "a king upon a monarch's throne, the remote and transcendent creator and

ruler of the world and life," unknown and unknowable to the exact extent of His transcendence, is not electrifyingly engaged at anything! He leads nowhere. Omnipotent and good, yet inactive in the face of dire need. But God immersed in the struggle we ourselves know, God risking His purposes with men and women to be only freely governed by Him, God leading by the enlistment of our hearts in His own designs,—“a God who needs our strength and grit and will and courage far more than He needs our tears and our penitence,”—

I venture to believe that religion, appealing to men from the high standpoint of such a thought of God and in the terms of the challenge which such a thought constitutes for every one of us, would find a new response in the hearts of men the world over. Men who to-day turn indifferent from appeals to save their own souls from the doom of a hell in which their intelligence can no longer believe as either just or rational would feel in the challenge to give their lives to the furtherance of a great divine struggle a new appeal, and in the task of joining forces with God in carrying creation to a yet more glorious consummation a new and thrilling joy. (P. 34.)

This is stirringly preaching God the Divinely Human, God within the range of human life, involved in its most momentous struggle, drinking of a cup of which, indeed, we can drink, and baptised with a baptism ours too.

Neither writer pretends to more than an initial emphasis upon the main truth he is preaching. It is no developed truth in the books, but one sketched; and if neither carries it far, neither has the truth itself gone far in the world's consciousness; and each is only recording and urging what is there transacting. The record is the record of an “imperfect realization.” Mr. Wells is preaching the Visible God (despite his title), but with obvious agnosticisms and stoppings short. He cannot say whether God Invisible is in God Visible. That would seem to be an implication of God's unity. Likewise essential resemblance. And there is nothing farther from his thoughts than to see in Jesus the God he portrays, save perhaps in his finely imaginative and kindling “new crucifixion.” Why might not that have

been the manner of the crucifixion? With nothing but the traditional conception of Jesus before him, he never questions his "true God" is not in Jesus. Is the conception of Jesus as a victor by suffering true to Scripture? On a re-reading of the Gospels is it not true that the life and the immortality is what matters, not the suffering nor the death so much? Is it not true that the Redeemer by moral combat is exactly the God we have in Christ, intimately grappling with the race's weight of perverse life, casting evil influence out of men and only in obvious clash with hells of iniquity? For what else do the scarcely intermitted temptations signify, the hidden malign powers uncovered in those "possessed"? The very passion of the Cross is the last and fearfulest of these combats, not just the acme of supine suffering. The Scriptures, too, are seen by Mr. Wells through the prejudicial medium of traditional views of them—he can consequently muster no help from them in the face of modern adverse criticism of them. The whole idea of the Trinity is contemplated as reflected in the creeds in which it receives a statement which keeps slipping into tri-theism; in the truculence, I do not doubt it is, of his keen criticism here he retains no disposition to consider any conception of Trinity. Both instances of non-constructiveness, on the Scriptures and on the Trinity, are however, true to the life and the facts of the "stirring and movement" which Mr. Wells tries to be the scribe of. He is not urging or thinking to elaborate ideas not held, but is recording hardly developed ideas that are held; and the new construction that has set in of the idea of God, has not set in about the historical Jesus, nor the Trinity, nor the Scriptures, in the area, at least, of the movement he is describing.

Mr. Reeman is as faithful to the actual state of inquiry. He does not consider the relation of "the God of the struggle" to Christ; I suppose it is true to say his is theistic inquiry, not Scriptural. He finds himself unable to employ the Scriptures in the re-conception of God; in the premises (ably surveyed, pp. 46-57) he is unable, for a fact, to do

this cogently. "For myself, therefore, I am compelled to turn to the only other way I can conceive by which such a knowledge of God [a knowledge based on fact] as we are seeking may possibly be attained. In a word, to the possibility of discovering it in the common facts and experiences of life as they relate to my own being and as they affect the world at large" (p. 57). To instance some: the fact that creation is gradual; the fact that creation is a development from within; again that the universe in every respect, spiritual and material, is governed by law, or characterized by method; the fact that at the heart of life is an intense and incessant conflict between good and evil; the fact that the unseen energy betrayed and observable in its effects is fully interpreted only in its highest effects, and so only in terms of consciousness and of similarity to human life. That is, Mr. Reeman works with those facts in which we can see the likeness of God, which in a passage quoted above (*True Christian Religion*, n. 28) Swedenborg calls "visible things of the world"; but lacking a view, theologically constructive, and also based on facts about them, of the Scriptures, he is not able to work with the class of facts about God which Swedenborg calls "perceptible things of the Word." The limitations of his discussion are much the limitations of Mr. Wells's discussion, and found in the movement each describes. The re-examination of Christian truth has not yet conceived anew, religiously and theologically, though it has done so historically, either Jesus or the Scriptures. Stoppings short, slights to nearly related questions, sacrifices sometimes of proportion and of other truth there are, but in the emphatic and enthusiastic acclaim of God Who is Man, struggling to His goal in and with His free people.

And in both books the conception of God so has in it, counterbalancingly, the rejection of much traditional Christian doctrine, the repellent theories of atonement (Mr. Reeman's last chapter is on "The New At-onement"), the doctrine of salvation by faith alone, held in a way to make nugatory human effort and struggle, the tri-

theistically-minded doctrine of the Trinity which asserts verbally the unity of God; and others. As the form of the title of Mr. Reeman's book intimates, both books are marked, perhaps his more especially, by the spirit of inquiry which is the breath of the reviving spiritual life. Both books seek a basis in the facts of life for what we shall think and believe. Both are concerned with the idea of God in the interests of life, and the living it best. A new manual of spiritual obligation issues from the idea of God advanced in the books—a manual of charity in the trades and professions, labor and commerce of men, that is like a chapter of Swedenborg's "Doctrine of Charity," given a modern dress,—follow the "Doctrine of Charity," n. 104, on Charity in Judges, with pp. 119-125 in Wells, on what the kingdom of God asks of a barrister. Morning begins in the night, and the first rays of morning are themselves an imperfect light to see in; but in point of being emancipated and of emancipating from traditional doctrines which, as Mr. Wells says, have played a large part in "obscuring, perverting and preventing the religious life of mankind"; in exhibition of the mood of inquiry, and of regard to fact, and of the spiritual reference of all our activity; in preaching God as Man, struggling with His creatures in their lives and by their suffrage to a common social goal, a redeemed society, these two books are witnesses to "the dawn," whose realizations are imperfect, truly, but to be hailed with a cheer none the less by every "watcher for the morning."

In this last, the main idea of both books, we have a truth which, according to these reports, is beginning to live in the world's consciousness; a truth which, however imperfect its theological statement or incomplete its discernment, is yet not just doctrinally confessed, but actually lodged in the living and current thought, swaying men, residing in what they are by it challenged to do. It is the general truth of the Divine Human Life, though it is not seen that into that life Jesus rose; the truth of the existence of God as Divine Human, of "God finite," of God in the range

of finite apprehension, devotion and struggle. Right here, where I believe it has been thought by us that enlightened inquiry would be interested last of all, the liberating enlightenment of the processes of the Second Coming has availed to bring men, however confusedly and imperfectly. Both writers, notably Mr. Wells, feel there is a power in the "stir and movement" as of God's own moving onward. There is a challenging momentum to it. It will work religious re-alignment. "The time is at hand when many of the organized Christian churches will be forced to define their positions, either in terms that will identify them with the renaissance, or that will lead to the release of their more liberal adherents" (*God, the Invisible King*, p. 173). If only the movement itself had something more for definition than its own slow groping. It is without revelation, Mr. Wells asserts, and requires no such guidance. It is a process of truth, he says, guided by the God he has preached in men. It is that, assuredly; but is outwardly evidenced revelation any other process? May not definition be to hand? When God comes in deeper spiritual life to men, does He not come teaching the truths of that life?

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

NEW-CHURCH EDUCATION AND NEW-CHURCH SCHOOLS.

THE idea of New-Church education has been cherished and maintained from the earliest attempts to organize New-Church life. It was seen by some at least that a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of New-Church doctrines, and a proper understanding and application of them, involved a type of education yet to be defined and attained, an education which would combine scientific progress with moral and spiritual elevation.

To realize this idea, natural and inevitable attempts were early made to establish and equip New-Church schools. These attempts are instructive, and it is worth while to pause a moment and review some of them. To begin in this country, there were several important early centers of New-Church organization. First at Baltimore in 1791, then between 1810 and 1816 in Philadelphia, New York, and Cincinnati. In 1818 the Boston Society was organized.

There were, of course, earlier New-Church societies in England, and there some sporadic attempts were made to establish New-Church schools. For example, the "New School of Theology," in Manchester, 1812; the "London New Church Free School," 1822; the "Woodford School," and the "Manchester New Church Free School" in 1827; In 1845, "Emanuel College," the original of the "New Church College" at Islington. It would be an instructive chapter in the history of New-Church education to follow the fortunes of these schools. No less instructive, but more to our present purpose, is the story of New-Church educational effort in this country. The first impulse towards the formation of New-Church schools was the recognition of the special needs of the children and young people of the Church for systematic

instruction in the doctrines of the Church and in the ways of life brought to view in the light of "the doctrines." In fact, increasing stress was laid upon the importance of New-Church education in the early societies as soon as they got well established. It was seen and urged that New-Church education was necessary as well to keep the children in the Church as to put the Church in the position to do its full work; its work of developing its own powers and usefulness in the community.

First in England, from 1812 to 1830, and then in this country from 1830 to 1840, there was a general and earnest movement throughout the Church towards New-Church education and the establishment of New-Church schools. Education was discussed in the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, committees on education were appointed and resolutions were passed in the General Convention, in the Western Convention, in Association meetings, and in societies. As a result, schools were actually started in several societies, as in Boston, Bath, Portland, Bridgewater, Yarmouth, Providence, Abington, and Cincinnati.

For New-Church educational history, interest centers mainly in the schools at Boston and Cincinnati; for out of these grew eventually the Waltham New Church School, the New Church Theological School, and Urbana University.

In 1836 the Boston Society began a school for children of both sexes, with two ladies as teachers. After two years the school was enlarged to include older boys, and Mr. E. A. Beaman was put in charge. It continued until 1843. This venture was the outgrowth of the general interest in New-Church education at the time; but it was especially due to the intelligent leadership and stimulus of Mr. Wilkins, Dr. Samuel Worcester, Benjamin Hobart, and Warren Goddard. Dr. Worcester was chairman of the Convention Committee on Education and submitted several important reports; Warren Goddard in the meeting of the Massachusetts Association, May 4, 1837, moved a resolution looking to the establishment of a New Church High School. Benjamin Hobart, as chairman of the Committee on Education of the Massachusetts

Association, proposed a complete system of New-Church schools: Primary Schools for the several societies, High Schools for the Associations, and a College or University under the management of the General Convention. This report is one of the most interesting and important educational documents in the history of the Church (see *New Jerusalem Magazine*, Vol. XII, 1838). It was with some such idea that the Waltham New Church Institute of Education was incorporated in 1857. No definite practical action was taken by the Institute, but in 1860, under the auspices of Benjamin Worcester and Edwin A. Gibbens, a School was opened at Waltham. Mr. Gibbens was a teacher of the classics of real ability, and the school increased from 12 to 60 in four years. The next year, 1864, the Institute took over the Waltham School and has carried it on ever since. Mr. Worcester was Principal up to the time of his death and succeeded in making it an important factor in the educational life of the Church. Throughout most of its history it was co-educational, but recently it was made a school for girls only. It has aimed to fill the place of a good preparatory school, as well as to fit the pupils for life. Under the present management, with Miss Martha Mason as Principal, the School has a promising outlook, and in view of the needs of distinctive feminine education it ought to be an increasingly vital component of our educational system.

The educational interests and the educational leadership in the New-Church community in and around Boston led to another institution of primary importance, the New Church Theological.

The subject of ministerial supply and ministerial education was introduced into the General Convention by a paragraph in the President's annual address at the meeting in Chicago, June, 1865, and by the report of a committee appointed to consider this paragraph and to report upon a plan of action. The committee reported to the Convention held the next year in Boston, June, 1866, and recommended that a divinity school be opened at the earliest day possible. The Convention appointed a special committee to carry out this recommenda-

tion, and the committee proceeded at once to arrange for opening the school on the third of July following. From this beginning, the Theological School has grown steadily in resources and efficiency, but its growth has been all too slow for the needs of the Church; it has been constantly cramped in its operations and usefulness by the lack of highly trained teachers and by the lack of funds to provide an adequate faculty. The situation in the Church at large now is very much the same as when the School started. The proportion of unemployed ministers, and the proportion of societies without ministers is just about the same as it was then. This condition can only be remedied by a more systematic development of our educational ideas, resources, and opportunities. If the school system proposed by Mr. Hobart in his report to the Massachusetts Association, Aug. 2, 1838, had been put in successful operation, the condition of the Church would in all probability be now very different from what it actually is; the children and young people of the Church would have begun at once to enjoy the privilege and benefits of systematic education in and for the Church, and would thus have been prepared for a New-Church life of usefulness in the community and in the world; in this way they would have been kept in the Church and the Church would have been kept in them; the Church would have become more and more a distinctively educated body of men and women such as the descent of the New Jerusalem must some day create and carry to ever increasing perfection.

After the discontinuance of the Boston School, there seems to have been a complete suspension of interest in New-Church schools throughout New England for a period of nearly twenty years; from 1843 to 1860, when the interest revived and found expression in the opening of the Waltham School and later of the Theological School.

The reasons for this disastrous loss of interest are very much to be pondered. It was due primarily to the failure of the schools to answer needs and expectations, but it was also due to deep and serious conflict of opinion. In the first place, the public schools came into operation meanwhile, and

they were supported from patriotic and democratic motives; on the other hand, distinctively New-Church schools were looked upon not merely as practical failures, but as narrow and sectarian in principle. In the second place, there were from the beginning two opposed views of New-Church school policy; some held that the schools should not only be distinctive but exclusive, and should admit only children baptized in the New Church; others held that while the schools should be distinctive, they should be open to all comers, to all who sought their advantages. On the whole the early tendency in England was to the latter course; in this country, it was to the former. As a matter of fact, the distinctiveness was more formal than actual, whereas the opposition between exclusiveness and liberality was fatal. Nevertheless these two conflicting views and policies have persisted; they are best represented now by Urbana University and the Academy school at Bryn Athyn.

The "Academy" was originally an educational and propagandist movement in the direction of more distinctive teaching, but this aim soon widened into more distinctiveness of organization and life. The first efforts, however, were directed to the establishment of schools. Beginning with a theological school and a collegiate department, other departments were added until all grades were provided for, from kindergarten to college. In 1896, the schools were moved to Bryn Athyn; and in 1899, a sufficient endowment was secured to lay the foundation for a well equipped school system. As parts of the system, parish schools were established in Pittsburgh, Chicago, Berlin, Parkdale.

This system is at the present time the most extensive school organization the New Church has accomplished. It may be considered as an experiment in the policy of exclusiveness, religious and social as well as educational, carried out with rigorous consistency. It is too soon to judge of its success.

A more liberal conception is represented by the foundation and operation of Urbana University. Reference has already been made to the early educational discussions and movements, which issued in the opening of schools in several New

Church societies. The leading motive here was instruction of the children and youth in the doctrines of the Church, but a further motive was the idea that School education as a whole could and should be carried on in the light and under the influence of the doctrines of the Church; in other words, the idea that there was possible a definite and distinct and complete New-Church education, as well as New Church thought and life in general.

One of these society schools was opened in Cincinnati, in 1840. The subject had been agitated and discussed in the Western Convention for several years, but nothing practical was done. The actual beginning and operation of the school was due to the initiative of a group of private individuals, who raised funds and organized the school under the management of Milo G. Williams. Mr. Williams was a successful and experienced teacher, a man of solid ability and worth; and with T. O. Prescott in the classical department and a Mr. Coombs in the primary, he soon had a flourishing school. At first only children of New-Church parents were admitted, but later, when Mr. Williams assumed entire control of the school as his private business, this condition was removed. The school was closed at the end of two years and a half, when Mr. Williams accepted a call to a professorship in Cincinnati College. Mr. Williams was a man of scientific tastes and acquirements, and was prominent in the scientific circles in Cincinnati and surroundings. In Dayton, where he was for a time Principal of the High School, he took a leading part in establishing the Dayton Manual Labor Institute. At one time, he was Principal of the High School in Springfield, and while there he discovered a new botanical species. With his experience and attainments, Mr. Williams was well qualified to conduct a New Church educational enterprise. He had won a high position in the educational circles of the whole community. Fortunately, his methodical habits led him to keep a diary, and in this we have an account, the most complete account, of the origin of Urbana University.

It is a curious fact, and one significant of the temper of early New-Church educational movements, that the Rev. J. P.

Stuart was a prominent factor in the early history both of the Academy schools and of Urbana University. During one of his missionary tours in Ohio, he stopped in Urbana and had a conversation with Col. John H. James on the subject of education.

. . . the importance of early religious instruction, the possibility of establishing a school of higher grade for educating our youth under the influence of the Church, had special consideration. As a result of this conversation, Mr. James addressed a letter to Mr. Stuart, bearing date of March 26, 1849, in which is this proposition: I will give ten acres of ground for the site of a New Church university, to be selected from my lands about Urbana, . . . I regard the land I offer worth \$1,000, and I stipulate that the sum of \$2,000 shall be contributed by others within one year, and that some building suitable for a school shall be erected within three years.

This proposition was favored by the friends of the Church in Urbana, and was submitted to Mr. Williams for his opinion. He gave it careful consideration from all points of view and decided in favor of it. He based his approval on the conviction,

that the time had arrived when the New Church should adopt more efficient and more certain means for the diffusion of the doctrines of the New Jerusalem; and that there were no better means of accomplishing the end proposed than the proper educating and training the young in the doctrines and life of the Church.

In considering the proposition that he should close the Academy in Dayton, move to Urbana, and take charge of the new institution, he remarks

"For many years I had been an advocate of combining literary and scientific instruction with the philosophy and doctrines of the New Dispensation in the course of education." He adds, "I had no doubt of success, if the institution could be sufficiently endowed."

On November 15, 1849, a meeting was held in Urbana, and among those present were Rev. J. P. Stuart, Rev. Sabin Hough, and Rev. George Field. This meeting, of which John Murdoch was made chairman and J. P. Stuart secretary, discussed the establishment of a college under the auspices of

the New Church for two days, and the outline of a plan was agreed on; a board was appointed and authorized to prepare an act of incorporation to be submitted to the Ohio legislature at its next session. The act was approved by the legislature March 7, 1850. The corner-stone was laid March 17, 1851.

In the meantime, Mr. Williams had moved to Urbana and opened a private school, which immediately overflowed its accommodations. At a meeting of the Board, July 22, 1852, the College was organized, the departments designated and professors appointed. On Sept. 7, 1853, the College was opened. Mr. Williams acted as President. His school was merged in the College, and for the next three years the number of students increased steadily and rapidly to about 128. Then there was a steady falling off until the sixties, when the condition of the country was such that school life was demoralized everywhere and the College was practically suspended.

This is the story of the first phase of the most sustained effort the New Church has made in the field of higher education. We must pause to get the lesson of this much of the story, and especially to inquire why the effort was not a success, why the initial progress was not maintained, why after the remarkable increase of the first three years, there was a steady and rapid decline? From this point of view, the story has been told and these questions have been answered more at length in the *Messenger* of April 7, 1909, but this is the occasion to emphasize the importance of at least two features of the situation, and to enforce the lesson thereof. In a word, the decline was due to two causes, the lack of adequate endowment and the lack of an adequate faculty. Under these conditions, the increase of students is more and more embarrassing and disastrous. In the case before us, students continued to pour in until the lack of educational facilities was discovered, then they began to leave, dissatisfied and disappointed; each successive class, as they came to their third year, left in turn, and the new arrivals were less and less sufficient to fill their places. So it went from bad to worse. It was an impossible situation. A faculty of three or four, whatever their qualifications, could not possibly do the work

required to meet the needs of a miscellaneous body of 130 students.

We should not from this case therefore draw conclusions adverse to higher New-Church education. If the educational ideals with which Urbana University started could have been properly worked out, the result would have been very different, and the history of the Church would show a condition of health, vigor, and prosperity that would be worthy of the New Jerusalem.

Efforts were made to stem the tide of adversity; one of these was to secure the energy and influence of Chauncy Giles, then pastor of the Cincinnati society, by making him President. But as Mr. Giles could not give his whole time and full services to the school, there was little change in the situation.

In 1870, Frank Sewall, the young pastor of the Glendale society, was made President. Mr. Sewall brought to the position some high qualifications. He had unbounded educational enthusiasm, untiring energy, and fine organizing abilities. He soon had a small faculty of college bred men and constructed a remarkably symmetrical and comprehensive curriculum. He then threw his energies into the work of raising a \$50,000.00 endowment. In this he was successful, but the sum was inadequate. However, he raised the academic level of the school considerably; and impressed upon many successive groups of young men a worthy ideal of liberal education under New-Church influences. But he struggled with fundamentally adverse conditions, and after 17 years of almost superhuman labor, he decided to resign and leave the work in other hands.

On the whole, but with some painful vicissitudes, the school has remained at the level where Mr. Sewall left it. With the small means available, it has not always been possible or practicable to secure trained and experienced administrators and teachers, and the school has suffered both in character and in reputation in consequence, but the administration has been true in the main to the ideals of liberal New-Church education.

More recently, there has been considerable improvement in the condition of the school. In the first place, the Ropes endowment of the Chair of Modern Languages added about

\$65,000.00 to the funds. In 1900, Russell Eaton was called to Urbana to minister to the society and also to give religious instruction in the school. Mr. Eaton organized a systematic course of doctrinal instruction as a regular part of the curriculum, and this has been a standing feature of the college instruction ever since. Later Mr. Eaton became administrative head of the school and during his administration improvements were made in the faculty and in the general equipment. Mr. Smyth, who was a student at Urbana University under Mr. Sewall, has rendered valuable services through his influence as President of the Convention and through college friendships, especially the timely service of raising the larger part of the money needed to renovate with all modern improvements the college buildings and dormitories. Mrs. James R. Carter also, who is a daughter of Mr. Giles, the former President of Urbana University, has given warm personal support to these improvements, and as President of the National Alliance of New Church Women has done much to arouse interest and co-operation in the work of supporting the school with money and students.

In view of these encouraging circumstances, it seems opportune to consider the possibilities of Urbana University as a New-Church institution of higher education. It has been throughout the history of the Church the almost unanimous conviction and opinion of thoughtful New Churchmen that higher New-Church education is an indispensable factor in the growth, welfare, and usefulness of the Church; on the other hand the history of the Church shows that the lack of higher New-Church education has been a prime source of weakness, disintegration, inefficiency. It is unnecessary either to argue or to illustrate these two points. The question is what can be done to put Urbana University in the position to fulfil its purpose and meet the requirements of higher New-Church education. The first thing needed is the energetic and intelligent co-operation of all the friends of the institution, especially its alumni, in its support, and in its development. As a part of this work, there should be formulated a definite educational policy which all New Churchmen could unite in carrying out.

This policy should include the raising of \$500,000.00 as the minimum endowment needed for the beginning of good college and university work. The Church needs, obviously and urgently, a well equipped institution of higher education. Urbana University is ready at hand to fulfil this requirement, as soon as the necessary endowment is provided. It is now doing an indispensable work in preparing students for the Theological School; and it is also doing an indispensable work in preparing the young people of the Church for New-Church life in the world. But this work of preparation is now incomplete, imperfect; with an immediate increase in the endowment, the preparation could be at once raised to a distinctly higher level. The duty and the opportunity are both before us.

With the Waltham School, the Theological School and Urbana University working at their best, the Church would have new power, and would enter upon a new era of prosperity and usefulness.

LEWIS F. HITE.

THE POINT OF VIEW IN THE STUDY OF THE THEOLOGICAL WORKS

THERE are evidences of a growing consciousness of the difficulties of presenting well the doctrines of the New Church. One hears expressions of a sharpening sense of the "task" at ministers' meetings, and in the more private interchange of views among workers; on many sermons and in attempts after a more timely missionary literature one sees marks of striving after effectiveness. The earnest and eager disciple is more and more keenly aware that to preach the truth and life of the Second Coming well, is not easy to do. It is a Gospel that taxes the best powers of presentation. But so it has been from its original evangelization; why the keener sense of difficulties? Have these been multiplying? Are those peculiar to the day, also peculiarly great? Or have time, and effort, and failing appeal, served to bring out the true size and significance of the contemporary Gospel? Or, again, are the preachers and teachers of to-day less well

equipped for the work than those of a half century ago? What are the difficulties? It is a question especially urgent for an organization numerically stationary over a period of fifty years.

For the consciousness of difficulties to do us any good, for it to be more than just disturbing and weakening, for it to spur to greater and competent effort, those difficulties must become definite to it. Can we define any of them to ourselves?

Certainly some of them inhere in the doctrines themselves of the Second Coming. To begin with, there is the great mass of them. Whatever the age and the field, the very volume of the teachings constitutes a difficulty to the expositor of them. A proportioned grasp of them, in which all are given due weight, and the whole body of them effectually advanced, is a studied achievement. Not all minds will have the industrious habit, the logical progress, the balanced scope and the religious purpose that will keep central and essential what is so, and in the exposition of any teaching to bring the force of the consistency of all the teachings powerfully to bear. It is far easier though very laborious to frame a great word-index in six volumes like the monumental concordance by Potts than to compile a proportioned and representative compendium in one volume of the thought of Swedenborg—by whom have we one? Yet this rounded, proportioned, powerfully coordinated grasp of the doctrine of the Word of the spiritual life is the one honest representation of it to aim at.

Another standing difficulty consists in the superficial absence, for positive presentation of the doctrine, of system from the strictly theological works. Its "superficial absence," let it be remarked, and "for positive presentation of the doctrine," and from the works "strictly theological." Swedenborg's expository works are given a systematic form by their subject-matter (What is more masterful than the arrangement of "*Arcana Cœlestia*"?), and the philosophical works eminently, like "*Divine Love and Wisdom*," possess in all its precision, range and positive constructiveness the method of his earlier career, but when one comes to the theological works, especially the chief of them, "*True Christian Religion*," its

superficial system—most assuredly it has system—is polemical. Its topics, philosophically ordered though they are, given it by the errors of traditional Christianity (“True Christian Religion,” nn. 4, 5; Chap. XI). These are then most rigorously and systematically combatted. The positive doctrinal system of these works they leave the student rather to gather. It is there. But the entrance on it in the theological books of the Church is not to be found in their outward method, so much as in inward appreciation of their significance; outwardly they are systematic chiefly in the refutation of contemporary error. Eccentric preachers and teachers, upon whom the center and heart of the doctrine was not impressed, there have been, therefore, a-plenty, and preachers whose pulpit utterances were sure to be onslaughts on old teachings: the chief, if not the only, “system” they knew. Alive in the highest degree to the many-sided connectedness of the truth of the heavenly life, Swedenborg himself maintained a method of repetition (*Divine Providence*, n. 193) by which he hoped eventually, as his student persisted, to bring out something of the harmonious interrelations of thought which live in the truth. But this deeply imbedded harmony, lying close to the unity of the Divine, it is not easy to reach. To penetrate toward it is one of our standing difficulties in the study and pronouncement of the doctrines.

Still another difficulty inhering really in the doctrines is the breadth and depth of the intellectual setting which they require for good understanding of them and to lodge them in living thought. Doubtless Swedenborg did not ransack the world’s information and pain proficiency in various fields of human thought, to come out upon the field of the spiritual life and its world with no equipment gained from the former for the latter. Any student of his life knows better. As a matter of fact, all his previous varied and precise learning went to equip him for his mission as revelator. It was in that generous setting alone that he could understand and convey the truths to dawn on his mind. Are lesser minds, seeking a grasp of the same truths, exempt from the rigors of such a liberal preparation? Can we do without biology, and

psychology, the history of philosophical inquiry and historical study of the Scriptures, and expect to know progressively the meaning and express effectively the power of the doctrines of the New Church? We are not called on by this point of view to repeat in the small Swedenborg's particular preparation though we need acquaintance with his scientific works to follow him at our best in his theological; as he did to propound, we need preparation to expound the doctrine, but preparation belonging to the present stage of knowledge. That most precious and loftiest teaching that the Lord carried His humanity, at first so much like ours, into the perfection of the Divine Spirit, awaits the development by human thought of a deep-reaching psychology to become as clear to us as possible (cf. "*Arcana Cœlestia*," n. 3596 (1e)). Now the broad intellectual setting which the doctrines not only need but crave, is, again, an equipment not readily commanded.

We do not pretend to enumerate all the standing difficulties of fairly adequate and effective presentation of the doctrines. But from those we do name, we cannot omit the chief demand on us in order to a telling evangelization of the Second Coming. That is, that we and all professing disciples of the Lord in His Second Coming strive to have in us the richer life of that coming. Minus that effort and life, we are minus the light of it all. We rattle terms and formulas and concepts, but we do not shed light. It is the living of truth that is so enlightening. It is good that enlightens, charity, purpose to overcome wrong and evil, desire to help another to his best life ("*Arcana Cœlestia*," n. 6269 (2), 6405). Light is sown to the righteous. The tang of reality is in our teaching when this is attended by a degree of spiritual life of our own. Here the difficulty is always in our study and use of the doctrine to be studying good.

The persisting difficulties which have been mentioned, and others like them, are more easily seen and acknowledged than certain developing difficulties, proper not to the doctrines, but peculiar rather to the day and to stages and changes in human thought and knowledge.

Prominent among the latter difficulties is the impossibility, whatever its feasibility or effectiveness might have been, much longer or any longer to oppose a sectarian "system" with the polemic system of our own doctrine. Do the old dogmatic systems linger anywhere in any completeness? Take the religious field as a whole, and a polemical program of system against system is impossible. Old "systems" are at least recognizing their inexhaustiveness, they are even cracking and being "scrapped," or in other quarters renewed and given an altered significance. Living convictions are not down in the books. Re-interpretation has not had any church councils to congeal it. There is no longer any target for the old-style polemics which is so easy to find as a fixed and official system. Nor are the doctrines of the New Church a new "fixed system." They have their precise statement, and have coined their needed technical terms; but even with him whose mind was from the first moment of public utterance well in the light of the Second Coming, there was progress in precision of statement, and always a coming short of telling all. The new doctrines are a great forward movement of thought into truth, or, the other way about, the means of a progressive radiation of light—strike them still by dogmatizing on them and in the effort to reduce them to an exhaustive system, and you have something, but something else. Now where there is no longer a "fixed system," easily defined, in the books of one body, opposing another such in the statutes of another denomination, but great, living, ineffable truths in struggle in the arena of life itself with old ideas, false and inadequate, and with all the ancient and familiar evil of life, and those irrupting truths ignore organizational lines and imperceptibly make the books a dead letter, the partisan preacher besting one creed with another is an anachronism. The antagonistic lecturing and preaching once so formidable and prevalent is out of date. An appreciative and forwarding attitude marks the contemporary pulpit. Imaginative observing is required in it. Penetration to the living thought of men is demanded in it, sympathy with present seizure of the truth, intellectual strength and vision to guide on, discernment

of tendencies. The General Council did the ministry of the Convention a pertinent service in sending to each minister the copies of *The Watchman-Examiner* in which there ran articles on the new and the old theology—a kind of survey which we need, to give us to see our field in its living transformations. Are some of us belaboring the eighteenth century? Here is a difficulty in our task which has been developing. Once one so-called system of religious thought was dogmatically and definitely pitted against another. It was like having a single head to hit, and that a motionless one. But a world-wide movement of truth, variegated, and bewilderingly mixed in tendency, is the actual fact. Adjustment lags behind. Seeing truth in so large and ample a connectedness that we have points of interested and helpful contact with all earnest seekers after life more abundant; appreciating the growth of truth which is adopted into the actual life, not pressing simply the recognition of it as doctrine; going by touch with and observation of the spiritual life and thought that is, we shall be making the needed adjustment. We are called to a sympathetic, discerning, fact-seeking ministry, none too easy to render, worthy to have for an aim, glorious to achieve.

It is a question whether it is logical and whether it is true to fact, to enumerate as a second difficulty that has overtaken us one which certainly is intimately related to the preceding, if not essentially the same with it. To set forth the meaning of the doctrines is much more difficult than to recite what they say. Discussion is not nearly so easy as assertion. But inquiry into their meaning, inquiry by them into the truth of the fuller spiritual life of to-day, is the temper which they themselves exhibit, and propose to disciples. What else is the point of their motto, "Nunc licet"? Inquiry is also the prevailing temper of the day. Men want reasoned discussion, proceeding upon fact. For both reasons therefore those who seek to present the doctrines commendably need to command a power of illuminating discussion, tantamount to inquiry, and meeting inquiry into truth; a discussion which exhibits their bearing upon the activities and quality of our life. To handle

the doctrines as ideas all-interesting in themselves, the final say-so, the end of discussion and the closing of inquiry instead of the richest and most fruitful means of inquiry, is to repeal their motto. It is to stultify them. Yet do we at all readily or steadily manage a reasoned discussion by means of our doctrine, of the truth of life? Many of the essays, the "typical" essays, submitted in the recent Tract Competition of the Convention's Committee on Missionary Literature were unconscious assumption and assertion largely. Are we interesting a new dogmatism, a new "authoritative" system, those constitutionally dogmatic whose old dogmatism was no longer ministered to surely enough? How far are we practitioners of the mood of the motto, "Nunc litet," "Now it is men's privilege to enter with understanding on the mysteries of faith"? To avoid a professionally closed mind, closed in a different theology, and a profounder truth, but none the less closed; to walk sympathetically and inquisitively towards the light with others; to "get" their questions, to feel the force of their mental obstacles; to appreciate the steps by which the mentally active must in honesty move in their inquiry; to be able to push out into the current of living thought and actual reading the truths of certain mighty, unread books; is a difficult ministry.

A third developing cause of difficulty is to be found in the shift of interest in things theological which has occurred in the last half-century, and which we sometimes deride, and sometimes curiously resent, but rarely appreciate. Fifty, certainly a hundred years ago men and women knew their dogmas and spoke and thought ardently if not fiercely of them. There was a wealth of interest in theology *per se*. Now the prevailing interest in a doctrine is severely practical—is it an actual means to fuller life, to deeper spiritual experience, to freedom from the race's weight of perverse life? It is curious that a body of people whose favorite re-iteration it is that all life is of religion should sometimes resent this subordination of doctrine to life, or should grieve that the old interest in theology is a passion of the past. They themselves, for the most part perhaps, when they came to these

truths, were already devoted to a spiritual purpose and a religious life. It was not their original summons to the spiritual life—this attraction to the doctrines of the New Church. The appeal which they felt was the appeal of new explanations of the spiritual life, new enforcements of it. The solution of intellectual difficulties drew them on. They were won by books like Bayley's that straightened out for them the seeming paradoxes of the Word, books like Giles's that helped them free of the sense of injustice in the popular presentment of the doctrine of vicarious atonement, books, and tracts that lifted them free of the entangling thought of three "persons" in one God. They in turn extended to others similar help. And there were those who needed the same help. Today the perplexity over paradoxes in the Scripture is not at all so intense as the torture of heart at the inequalities of life. Men are appalled before evil, not, primarily, puzzled before falsity; their sympathy is with the unrighteously oppressed and morally imprisoned, not chiefly with the intellectually disturbed. Human life, loftier of motive, clearer of mind, freer in opportunity for whole development, is the concern. The shift of interest is wholesome. It is a piece of progress. It is a foot-fall of the Second Coming. It is the Lord's doing. Who should believe it more quickly, co-operate with it more spontaneously than those whose axiom it is that religion is of the life? And yet many organizations, and nameless individuals, have followed this shift in the spirit of the age, the impact of the Divine spirit upon the world, more closely and readily than we. We cleave tightly to pulpit methods and church habits and forms which insist that just doctrine should be supremely interesting to everybody. And then the purely theologically minded, those whose paramount interest is explanation, doctrine, the correct idea, proving audienceless, and futile, become perplexed, and resentful. It is an active promotion of the new religious stir and start that is now expected of religious bodies. They will either align themselves with it, or pass away. Can we utilize our doctrine to this end, not just recite it? Can we take its inspired account and announcement of the spiritual life to be, illuminatingly into all the spiritually

significant movements, aspirations, practical objects and seething pities of the day? Again this is not so easy as hawking explanations about; making the life fact is harder.

Add these developing causes of difficulty to the causes that inhere steadfastly in the character of the doctrines, and surely it is evident that it is no task quickly trained for, capably and usefully to present the teachings of the opened Word. Neither preacher nor teacher can spare preparation for his work. He cannot afford to cut it off short of the highest and widest possible education. The mental training needed for comprehensive hold on the doctrines and presentation of them; the liberal love of truth, and historical knowledge of the human mind's search for it; the broad setting of general knowledge in which the doctrines assume rich and timely significance; the conception of the spiritual life as an education, rather than as a lawless or forced experience; are not usually had save through the discipline and information of higher education. Nor the insight into the limitations of "systems," philosophical or theological, in which the world is said to be summed up; nor the free spirit of hearty and honest inquiry into truth. There is every reason to stand upon Swedenborg's own conviction that the ministry of the new life and its truth would be the product of university training. Even the appreciation of the interest in life over doctrine would come so, too, where the higher education, as at a spiritually purposed school, recognizes always the primacy of the spiritual life; or is based upon such a view as this, that "education's aim is to develop men and women who will work for the common good" (Strayer's "Teaching Process"). The schools of the Church at Urbana and Waltham espouse these ideals; the theological school at Cambridge desires higher education in the men that enter it. The consciousness growing on us how difficult the work is which we have undertaken to do, ought to become a spur to our educational activities at all these centers, emphatically at the third. For the run of students higher education alone will give ease and power where now handicap and difficulty and helplessness, even unconscious ineffectiveness, are all too frequent in the work of the ministry.

Just now we are interested to canvass and press in this and some succeeding papers, the point of view which higher education yields for the study of the doctrines of the church. Not that it results in a single point of view; it is manifold; but the point of view which higher education subserves as distinguished from the point of view which otherwise will control one's work—which will not be any one point of view, either. The outcome, at least the gist of higher education, is pretty much in the point of view the mind then takes in all its activity. Not matter but manner distinguishes the equipped man. For whatever one's approach to the theological works, one brings up in the doctrines in some fashion. They are the matter of the thought of all. But to some students they are the richest means of inquiry; to others they are a mass of closed dogma; to some others still they are a body of truth set in the world's developing thought and to be caught up and into this development of thought and life; to others they are a "system" whose isolation from the stream of influential thought is to be jealously guarded, in the interest especially of their "distinctiveness." The approach to them decides how they are going to be handled and what is going to be done with them. It establishes at once the likely value of the work to follow.

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

MATERIAL IN JOHN FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE
HOLY SPIRIT

As the end of His ministry approached, the Lord sought to uphold His disciples with certain promises, with three, especially. Throughout the last year of His ministry He had been predicting His death, and the manner of it (the prediction is reported as made on three occasions, but must have been discussed oftener, Matthew xvi, 21); and this prediction He invariably followed with a promise of resurrection. On the third day the Son of man would rise again. But the promise, involving the death it did, left them still stupefied. Only after the event could they take any joy in it, or even come to a clear understanding of it. (Luke xxiv, 8; John xx, 9.) About a second promise, on the contrary, they were much too clear — His promise, made in the last week of His ministry, to come again. How literally they understood the promise; and how immediately they came to expect His return! Their eagerness about it became a mainspring of Christian activity. Ultimately, about this promise, they were disappointed; for the Parousia was not what or when they expected. About the third promise they were both avid, and made content. Vividly and tenderly, on the very last day of His ministry, the Lord promised them the Holy Spirit. It was the final gift which He had, to make. Their spirits were buoyed up in the prospect of it. On their clarification later in the promise of resurrection by the event, the Lord also by act recalled His promise to them of the Spirit. He breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. (John xx, 22.) Relatively to a subsequent event, however, even this was still prediction of the gift, and excitement still further of their eagerest hope. At Pentecost they were filled full of the Spirit.

It is natural that the Gospel which records the Lord's

Farewell Discourses (John xiv-xvi) should be richest in utterance for the understanding of the Lord's farewell gift. And so in John the record of the Farewell Discourses is the section of all that Gospel, too, which is richest in its sayings about the Spirit. Here are the tenderest re-assurances to the distracted disciples, the sweetest promises of a nearer and even dearer presence with them than any yet. Like many another Christian doctrine the doctrine of the Holy Spirit receives a development in John much beyond what it gets in the Synoptics, because the author of the Fourth Gospel is already engaged in doctrinal reflection upon the Lord's sayings and statement of them. But not chiefly because John's is such a reflective record, with a doctrinal purpose (xx, 31), but truly far more because the Lord is promising the disciples His heart's full gift now in the last words which John records, is John's Gospel the richest in matter for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

There is indeed little in the letter of Scripture in the way of basis for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which is not to be found in John; there is quite a little peculiar in John, or peculiarly full and by comparison only glanced at in the Synoptic Gospels. The disciple who lay in the Lord's bosom pierced best to His Holy Spirit.

To the very names given the Holy Spirit, John's Gospel makes significant additions all its own. John seems alone in speaking of the Spirit as the Spirit of Truth (xiv, 17; xvi, 13; xv, 26; and cf. 1 John iv, 6; v, 6), but he is alone, too, in the use of that very appealing designation, "Comforter" (A V) or "Advocate" (R V margin), or "Paraclete" (xiv, 16, 26; xv, 26; xvi, 7). Called to one's side, and "taking one's side" against the adversary, at the disciples' side, strengthening them to speak under persecution their message for the establishment of the kingdom (Matt. x, 19ff) — this is the significance the term had, somewhat obscured by the usual translation. To the New Testament phenomenon of the Spirit John generally applies with the other Gospels what is a New Testament term, Holy Spirit. That name is, indeed, given by New Testament writers to God's activity in Old

Testament times (e. g., Acts 1, 16; 2 Pet. i, 21), and the name itself occurs three times in the Old Testament (Psalm li, 11; Isa. lxiii, 10, 11). But in neither the use of the term in the former case nor in its occurrence in the Old Testament can it bear the strict significance which, we know, it bears in the New Testament usually. Is this not the substance of the verbal criticism made in "True Christian Religion," n. 158, that in the three Old Testament passages named the phrase literally is Spirit of Holiness? For upon this otherwise it might in turn be remarked that idiomatically Spirit of Holiness is Hebrew for Holy Spirit.

In John all the circumstances of the Last Discourse as well as the actual utterances make it plain that the Spirit is the personal effluence of Jesus. Would the promise of anything less than this have heartened the disciples at the hour of parting? They craved the continuance of their communion with Him. He promised them an inner and so more intimate intercourse with Him. Nothing less or other than His personal indwelling and conscious activity with them could have been or was promised. "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you" (John xiv, 18). Yet He would not come strictly in Person, but in effluence. The Spirit should receive of His, and shew it unto the disciples, and of the Father's, which was His, also (xvi, 14, 15). The Lord and the Spirit are distinguished (xiv, 16), and as He and His, or as Person and effluence. Not He Himself in His Risen Body of perfect human reaction to the Divine life, in which He is hidden in imperfect human actuality, but the interiorly exerted influence of it now in all men, in which He should be manifested (xiv, 22), was the gift promised.

Yet this distinction, the distinction we face in the Trinity, is not made or spoken easily, for there is no person without effluence, and there is person in the effluence. The Holy Spirit is not impersonal. Upon that point the pronoun of reference to the Holy Spirit seems no assistance either way, for when the noun is neuter (Spirit), the pronoun is; when the noun is masculine (Paraclete), the pronoun is; and this is so in that instance of this manner of passage which is usually

cited for the "personality" of the Holy Spirit (xvi, 13); that is, the pronoun gets its gender rhetorically, not logically. But personal title is given the Spirit in the title Paraclete; and work that is the work of person is ascribed to Him, of course, the work of the One Divine Person. Without bringing into our thought any other Person, we should, however, have to assert of the Spirit of the Farewell Discourse that He is Person. In Whom else is truth? (John xiv, 17; xvi, 23.) Power to teach, spur to recollection? (xiv, 26.) Capacity to bear witness? (xv, 26.) Reproval of sin, revelation of righteousness, enforcement of judgment? (xvi, 8-11.) Both that the Spirit is the effluence as distinguished from the Person of Jesus, and yet is personal and not impersonal, that action and saying of His attest, "He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (xx, 22).

And that passage of constant significance holds another peculiar contribution from the Fourth Gospel to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, that this personal effluence is the effluence of the *Risen* Jesus. This begins to be implied in the fact that only on farewell does the Lord proffer the Holy Spirit; that the mission of the Spirit is postponed to the Lord's departure (xvi, 7); and here is implied in that the action and word of xx, 22 are those of the Risen Christ. But there is in addition the explicit declaration (vii, 39), "The Holy Ghost was not yet; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Here is a doctrinal reflection of John's, the nice significance of which Christian theology is to appreciate only now, by the help of further knowledge of the glorification of Jesus. The insight occasionally of commentators, like Dummelow ("The One Volume Bible Commentary," at vii, 39, and again at xvi, 7ff), who speaks of the Spirit as the Spirit of the Glorified Christ, far outruns Christian theology generally, which is unhelpful on this point and must be so while the nature and outcome of the process referred to in Scripture as the Lord's glorification is unknown. The story of the Lord's inner life, as told in the inner significance of the O'd Testament for His life, alone gives the information. As the Lord, in culmination of the glorification of the assumed nature, rose into a body of

perfect human reaction to the Divine, which itself then was Divine, thereupon there went from that body the more immediate and perceptible Divine action upon the hearts and spirits of men which is the Holy Spirit. But how then shall we take passages, most of them not in this Gospel, which denominate activity of other than the fully glorified Christ the Holy Spirit? It may not, in the strict meaning of the term, be the Holy Spirit which is reported active at baptism and temptation (Matthew iii, 16, 17; Mark i, 10, 11; John i, 32), for here the term is either Spirit of God or simply the Spirit; but He is so reported by that name active at the very conception of Jesus (Matthew i, 20; Luke i, 35). John xii, 28, indicates that the glorification was gradual. And we think of it usually as dating from the very conception of the Master, when already the nature to be assumed was by influence of the Divine organically modified, altering from an imperfect receptacle to a perfect embodiment of the Divine, to the very substance and structure of it. This, I believe, is our usual accounting for these passages which add a light and a modification on John vii, 39 not in the Fourth Gospel. This customary explanation can take care doubtless of the fact that Elizabeth, the mother of John Baptist, saluted by Mary now pregnant, is "filled with the Holy Ghost" (Luke i, 41), and that Zacharias, the father, is too at the circumcision of John (Luke i, 67); the Lord's glorification being life-long, even from conception, with the first steps in glorification the Divine activity was becoming of that character strictly meant by the New Testament term, "Holy Spirit."

The work of the Holy Spirit is abundantly described in John. All that the Lord toiled and suffered and fought to effect, and to make possible, must be the Spirit's care. The Fourth Gospel is a compendium of the work; xvi, 8-11, is itself a kind of classification of it. Where sin is reproved, the Holy Spirit does it; and where righteousness is impressed, and where judgment between right and wrong is enforced. Progressive understanding of the truth is of the Spirit's accomplishing (xvi, 13ff); and so must the Second Coming be (xvi), when the truth is more plainly disclosed, and arcana

reserved are broached (xvi, 12, 13, 25, 26); which would also appear from the fact that the manifestation of Father and Son is the Spirit's effecting, too (xiv, 3, 18, 21; xvi, 14, 16; xiv, 20); — but where is there plainer telling of the Father (xvi, 25) until the revelation now of the Word's spiritual sense and of the doctrine of the letter illumined by the spiritual sense? Revelation generally is the Spirit's work (iv, 24; xiv, 26; xvi, 13ff); enjoyment of the truth as a river of living water in one (vii, 32–39); belief in the Son (iii; xv, 26); the establishment of the kingdom which Jesus preached (i, 33; iii, 5, 6, 8); the regeneration of each and every man regenerated. Because in all these directions gains are to be made, greater works than Jesus did shall the Spirit do (xiv).

We need to bid the Spirit come. "Paraclete" is a passive designation — One summoned by. In point of existence the Spirit must always be by one, and also in point of effort to lead one into the spiritual life; but in respect of the actual regeneration of us, the Spirit is by only upon the invitation of that strangely free moral agent each of us is, who can shut out of himself the Holy Spirit, committing the blasphemy that cannot be undone. There is a condition upon the Holy Spirit's doing His work. Why does He not do it in the world at large? Judas, not Iscariot, asked the question. And the Lord in answer said there was a condition precedent upon this more intimate activity, namely, that one should love the things of Christ and keep His words (xiv, 22–24). "The Lord makes the energies [of the Holy Spirit] operative in those *who believe in Him*" (True Christian Religion, n. 149). Yet if one has that condition in one's heart, one has been moved to it by the Spirit, just as when one has it not, one is still moved to it by the Spirit. We bid Him come, but it is the Spirit that says, Come. "The essential active force by which adaptation and disposition are effected is from the Lord" (*Ibid.*, n. 150e).

W. F. W.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE GLORIFICATION IN REFERENCE TO THE REDEMPTION OF SOCIETY

A TREATMENT of the Lord's Glorification necessitates, by way of introduction, something regarding the human to be glorified; in a word, it must deal to some extent with the Incarnation and the state of things that had led up to it.

The particular problem that was offered in the condition of the human race immediately before the birth of Jesus Christ was the problem of bridging over a vast distance, — a distance not *spatial*, but *spiritual*. Increasing waywardness, ignorance, and self-will, were removing men farther and farther from effectual Divine influence. For this reason the pre-incarnation activity of the Divine Human, by which we mean that aspect of the Divine under which He had hitherto been perceptible to those who lived in Heaven, — no longer presented an appeal sufficient for the needs of the whole human race. Formerly it had been enough that God show Himself in the forms of angelic life and thought, and thus *mediately* influence men on earth. But this no longer served the purpose. Only persons of the highest religious type, that is, those who received their religion by intuition rather than reflection, were being saved, and even they with increasing difficulty. On earth real spiritual life was dying out, and in the unseen realm the hells were growing in number and power. Men on earth were so pressed upon by evil influences, both seen and unseen, as to be more and more cramped in their freedom of choice, more and more confused in their discernment between right and wrong, truth and falsity. This lack of freedom was even more apparent in the other life; for, of the myriads gathered there since the times of the Most Ancient Church, many persons were salvable; but thus far the overwhelming influence of the environing wickedness and falsity had prevented their reaching a true and settled heavenly state. "The Heavens

were becoming enfeebled " for the reason that not only were men from the earth entering heaven in decreasing numbers, but those already there, in the lower heavenly states of life, were becoming demoralized and infested by the prevailing condition of things. In fact this intimate interdependence and intercommunication of the heavens and the earth greatly intensified the situation. For it is a law of the spiritual life that a good state of things on earth is really the base and the support of the heavens. The heavens and the church on earth together constitute one organism, in which, according to the teaching contained in Swedenborg's theological writings, the heavens are the head, the breast, and the middle of the body, while the church, that is, the spiritual life, on earth makes the loins and feet. Thus, as spiritual life on earth was dying out, inevitably the integrity of the heavens themselves was threatened.

What was necessary to meet such a situation? Evidently some means that had not been employed before. Swedenborg's representation is that the state of affairs both in the visible and the invisible realms was unprecedented. This is borne out by a discriminating view of historical conditions at the time of the Lord's Advent; for a great poverty of spiritual life is thereby disclosed. As has been said, there was distance (*spiritual*, not *spatial*) to be overcome. Salvable persons, both on earth and in the world of spirits, were no longer responsive, save with exceptions already noted, to the ways in which the Divine Human had hitherto made its appeal. Moreover, those constituting the hells could be conquered and put under ordered restraint only by the Divine, meeting and contending with them, as it were, on their own territory. This overpowering of the hells would, in fact, have to precede the re-arranging of the heavens, and the re-establishment of spiritual life on earth, if we think of it in time terms.

For the accomplishment of these ends, Jehovah became incarnate, took to Himself a fleshly Humanity, or, as the Writings have it, put on the natural degree, which, hither-

to, had been merely potential in Him. In other words, what had always been possible with Jehovah, now became actual, in answer to men's spiritual needs.

The Lord's Glorification consisted in what He achieved in His own Person during the earthly life. In the Writings, it is expressed by various forms of statement: for instance, that He made His Human Divine; that He expelled the Human derived from the mother and put on a Human from the Father; that He expelled the maternal human and brought down the Paternal Human; that He effected a union of the Human Essence and the Divine Essence.

In the structure of His Person in this world, the Lord was made up of Internal, External, and Body, like any other man. But the nature of His parentage opened up possibilities quite different. An ordinary man, no matter how far he may progress in regeneration, can never become more than a recipient of life; his evils are not utterly cast out of his nature, but are merely removed from the center of thought and desire to some far-off boundary, as it were, where they are kept quiescent, and to all practical purposes, dead. On the other hand, the personal structure of the Lord,—Internal, External, and Body,—being conceived directly out of the Divine, was capable not merely of being a recipient of the Divine, but of *becoming* Divine, with evils not only removed, but cast out. Along with this constitution of the Lord's Person, while He was on earth, there went two possibilities. From the Divine heredity there was the possibility of a life Divinely motivated, and at length *Divine* in its very Humanity; from the maternal, merely human heredity, with its worldly, selfish tendencies, there was the possibility of a naturally-motivated life. The one possibility constituted the germ of the Divine Human, and in its attainment was the Divine Human; the other possibility, with the downward-looking tendencies just noted, in connection with the body and the natural organization, constituted the "merely human." It was in the "merely human" realm, with its evil hereditaries, that the Lord was assaulted by all the hosts of hell.

Arrayed against these evil assaults were the higher tendencies from the Divine heredity, influencing Him through the Internal. His consciousness was the field of these conflicting tendencies and possibilities. Each time the Lord put aside an ill-judged or evil suggestion from the lower heredity and honored, in its place, the leading of the higher heredity, He put off to that extent the maternal human, and to that extent made His Human Divine. This was the process of Glorification. Finally, through the culminating temptation, the Passion of the Cross, the process became complete, and the Lord's Human was Divine, even to the Body, with all of its powers and functions, with which He rose from the grave. The outcome of all this was the "Divine Natural." "God became Man, not only in first principles, but in ultimates." As all things merely material were cast out by the Lord and replaced by spiritual substance in the entire Person, the Lord, instead of being local, and therefore limited, became Universal and Representative, with a living body of human experience, through which He is in immediate and intimate touch with human life everywhere. Thus His relationship to us is that of immediate and direct, rather than mediate and indirect, influence and touch. "The last Adam became a life-giving spirit."

It seems to me that the Glorification, together with the Incarnation that necessarily preceded it, has some vital bearings upon what is commonly known as the redemption of society. By the redemption of society we mean saving men not only as individuals, but as members of vitally related groups. An individualistic conception of the spiritual life is inadequate, and in some of its forms, may be utterly false. Under its influence men are led to inquire as to what steps or transactions are necessary for the salvation of the individual soul, and then to rest content, when once it is thought that such conditions have been complied with. A true social gospel recognizes the responsibility resting upon the individual soul for its eternal welfare, but it goes farther. It endeavors to transform

and elevate the whole system of interrelation and intercommunication in which men must live. Having social regeneration in view, it not only emphasizes what an individual may receive for himself in entering upon a better way of life, but also what he may hope thereby to impart to the common good. The redemption of society concerns itself with an environment in which the moral and spiritual life can flourish, in the interdependence of various groups of our civilization, one upon the other. It also seeks to realize, in concrete ways, certain broad universal principles of justice which shall have the effect of binding all classes together.

As we follow the process of the Lord's Incarnation and Glorification, we see that the whole effort is directed not merely toward the saving of the individual for his own sake, but as a part of a larger organic whole. For, according to the light brought out in the Writings, the heavens and the spiritual life on earth are one. They are interdependent and intercommunicative, so much so that upon the Lord's success in establishing a real spiritual life here depends the integrity of the heavens themselves.

As has been said, the outcome of the Lord's earthly life was for Himself the Glorification. For us the outcome was the creation of a new element,—a purer Humanity, in which we may "live, move, and have our being." In other words the Lord effected a permanent cleansing of our everyday human life by His own presence in that life. When He came among men, there was such a state of affairs that every institution, every profession, every relationship of life to a lamentable degree, was suggestive of the lowest possibilities. Tax-gathering was an opportunity of extortion; military service was an invitation to violence and brigandage; ecclesiastical office meant harshness, greed, and bigotry. All of this was merely the manifestation of an inner fact; namely, that the personal powers of darkness had gained such a controlling influence in the realm of thought and motive that in earthly affairs the whole tendency was toward the prostitution, the

perversion, rather than the rightful exercise of the various offices and relationships of human life. The Lord, Himself, living a real human life on the earthly plane and resolutely confronting its evil tendencies, purified the entire range of human activity. Accordingly, by virtue of His Eternal Presence on our human plane we are given power to see and actually to realize the higher, purer possibilities of every situation, every relationship, every office, every profession or business upon which we may enter. It must, of course, be borne in mind, as the history of the Christian Age has abundantly shown, that this Divine elevation of earthly function does not work automatically or apart from our own active consent, striving, and co-operation with the Divine effort.

In all this there would seem to be more than a hint as to the principles that should guide in the gospel and reformatory work that must be done in this world. In the Writings the whole spiritual life of the heavens and the earth is seen as one, and mutually dependent. In the same way, civilization on earth, taken by itself, can and should be regarded as an organism, made up of mutually dependent parts. For example, we know to how great a degree the whole structure of civilized life is dependent upon a certain soundness of material basis. There is the rough hard work, such as that of the railroads, mines, lumber camps, and other industries that might easily be named. If these do not carry on their functions, the whole scheme of things, including what we are accustomed to regard as the more highly intellectual and spiritual developments, falls into chaos. The cutting off of supply from the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania,—such as was threatened fifteen years ago, when winter was approaching,—is enough to cause a panic through the nation. In the late summer of 1916, consternation gripped the country, as it faced the prospect of a nation-wide railroad strike. The present war is being fought for the recognition and establishment of moral and spiritual ideals which shall make civilization secure; but if the material basis,

whether of food-supply, clothing, or equipment, should fail, the struggle would halt, with the idealism unattained.

In view of such vital interdependence, can the stability of civilization be maintained if the gospel message is not proclaimed and the redemption ideal implanted in groups of the population that are exposed to peculiar temptations and are sometimes neglected? Is the general life of society anywhere safe, unless everywhere there is the spiritual motive, ruling, directing, and inspiring the daily task? It is needless to say, that in the practical approach to such a problem, there must be neither patronage, condescension, nor sentimentality. In short the security of the world's general life depends largely upon a spiritual motive in our industrial groups, — a motive, which, if sustained, means cheerfulness, contentment and efficiency. The absence of such a motive means unsteadiness, discontent, and even a readiness to be led astray by demagogues and agitators. Yet, so long as there is bitterness over the withholding of what are regarded as elementary rights, the spiritual motive is not likely to gain entrance.

A work begun several years ago by one of the largest denominations in the United States, is of interest, in connection with this subject. It established what was known as a department of "Church and Labor," and appointed, to carry out the plan, one of its ministers, who, from his own actual experience, in early life, understood the special problems and temptations of the working man. His whole effort, ever since, has been on the one hand to induce the laboring man to be just and fair in his attitude toward the church, and on the other hand to awaken church members to an understanding of the special needs and viewpoint of large groups of people, who, whatever the fundamental causes may be, have become largely estranged from ordinary religious influences. If some of the particular methods employed, or some of the doctrines held and taught, in connection with such efforts are not always above criticism, there is at least the working of the true social instinct, which has for its object the filling of familiar haunts,

institutions, and habits of life with a religious content, by taking situations, companionships, and environment, and touching them with such a new meaning that they shall minister to and suggest the moral and spiritual life. It is the gospel living where men live, expressing itself in the rugged, direct, informal terms of every-day thought and speech, manifesting itself in forms of justice that are tangible, recognizable, and real.

In work such as this there would seem to be a boundless field for the New Church with its infinite treasure-house of "things new and old." There would thus be realized, in more and more practical ways, the spirit of the Lord, who has bound the heavens and the earth together as one redeemed whole, and who bids us look where we will, find ourselves in such environment as we may, and discover therein points of departure and avenues of progress toward the Heavenly Life.

EARL C. HAMILTON.

CURRENT LITERATURE

THE SOCIAL TEACHINGS OF THE PROPHETS AND JESUS*

Perhaps Professor Kent's volume on "The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus" cannot be better introduced to our readers than by a few sentences from the opening pages, as follows:

The discovery that the great prophets and founders of Judaism and Christianity were above all else social teachers and reformers is rapidly revolutionizing the study of the Bible. . . . Studied in the light of their historical background, their teachings can be readily interpreted into universal terms and used as a solvent for the social problems of to-day. . . . To be clearly understood both the teachings of the prophets and those of Jesus and Paul must be studied together as parts of a genetic whole. The chief aims, therefore, of this volume are to single out the important social teachings of the Bible, to translate them into clear English, and then to classify and present them so that they may be intelligently studied in the light of their historical setting and development. . . .

These social principles represent the common ground on which conservative and radical, Protestant and Catholic, reformed Jew and progressive Mohammedan—in fact, every man who recognizes the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—can unite and work for the realization of the ideals of the founders of their faith. These are the fundamental principles which the great prophets of Judaism and Christianity and of every vital religion supremely emphasized. In their eyes the petty differences which to-day divide the religious

* *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus.* By CHARLES FOSTER KENT, Ph.D., Litt.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1917. 364 pp., 12mo. \$1.50 net.

The Social Teachings of the Jewish Prophets: a Study in Biblical Sociology. By WM. BENNETT BIZZELL, Pres. Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. Boston: Sherman, French & Co. 1916. 237 pp., 8vo. \$1.25 net.

forces of the world were utterly unimportant. Deeds, not creeds, spirit, not forms, attitude, not professions, alone are essential. The social teachings of the prophets and Jesus, therefore, furnish the practical working basis on which the social and religious leaders of the world can co-operate in promoting and conserving the highest material and spiritual interests of the human race. (Preface.)

In this critical, transitional age, when selfish greed and materialism have nearly wrecked society, we are inexorably forced to the conclusion that the social principles of the prophets and Jesus are by far the most valuable assets that the past has bequeathed to us, for they furnish the only basis upon which an enduring civilisation can be reared. (Chapter I, p. 4.)

The closing words of this passage are a sufficient challenge to our attention at the present time. Elsewhere (p. 329) we find the author affirming that organized Christianity has "lamentably misinterpreted the social gospel of its Founder." And he then goes on to say that "the task of the twentieth century is faithfully and clearly to re-interpret that gospel into modern terms." This in part is the purpose of his book; for after his consideration of the social teachings of the prophets, he interprets Jesus as synthesizing and perfecting them. While he nowhere summarizes in concise form the social teachings of Jesus, he does so summarize His economic teachings, which evidently are of vital significance, and therefore deserve to be quoted:

Jesus' economic teachings are highly individualistic; but they rise to a plane where the interests of the individual and of society are absolutely identical. Briefly stated in modern terms, they are: (1) The possession of more things than are necessary for a man tends to destroy his freedom and his social efficiency. (2) The pursuit of wealth as an end in itself is incompatible with loyalty to a man's highest ideals and interests as well as to those of society. (3) Each man is under obligation to contribute to the wealth of society in exact proportion to his ability. (4) No man is entitled to share in the world's wealth who is not willing to work, and service to society constitutes his only valid claim to the possession of property. (5) Private property is a public trust to be administered for the best interests of society. (6) Society is under obligation to devise means so that each man who is willing to labor will have not only a living, but also an opportunity to contribute what he is able to the common wealth. (7) The rights of humanity are paramount to those of capital. (8) The cure of poverty

is the elimination of its ultimate causes, moral and intellectual, as well as economic. (9) In the Christian social order the dominant principle is not selfish competition but fraternal co-operation which aims to promote the economic welfare of each individual, of each class, and of society as a whole. (P. 239.)

The above passage occurs in that part of the volume (pp. 177-280) which is devoted to a presentation of The Social Ideals of Jesus, ending with a chapter on The Kingdom of God, the most important in the book. Professor Kent asserts that Jesus' teachings concerning the Kingdom of God have been totally perverted by the Christian Church; that the Kingdom of God is a practical ideal for this world, and was so understood by the earliest disciples of Jesus; that it involves the progressive actualization of all His social and economic teachings. "Thy kingdom come; thy will be done, as in heaven, so upon the earth," is not an idle bit of vocalization, but is a most pregnant petition for this world; for surely this is one of the instances where we may safely infer that the term "earth" means the entire human race regardless whether or not of the church. As our author says: "the kingdom of God is already established in the hearts of countless thousands," and "its leaven is even now slowly but certainly transforming the whole mass of society" (p. 279).

That this is a fundamental conception of Christianity, and that it is capable of being placed before mankind as an ideal consciously to be striven for, is evidenced by the following statements from the Declaration of Principles of a little organization designating itself as a "Brotherhood of the Kingdom," and consisting of Christians of various denominations:

The Spirit of God is leading the men of our time into a new appreciation of the fundamental conception of Christianity — the Kingdom of God on earth. The divine King is summoning all men to seek this Kingdom in its fulness and to make it a reality in the world. Accepting the ideal of the Master, and obeying his summons, we dedicate ourselves to this task and adopt the following Declaration of Principles:

1. That the Kingdom of God may mean much more than a divine human society, but it is certain that it can never mean anything less.

2. That this Kingdom includes the whole life of man and makes provision for all his needs.

3. That the idea of the Kingdom of God recognizes the spiritual being of man, implies a spiritual line of approach in social effort and furnishes the effectual spiritual dynamic in social activities.

4. That this Kingdom involves the saving of the individual by making him Christlike and the redemption of society by transforming it into the order of the Kingdom.

5. That this Kingdom implies such a social order as shall insure justice among men, give every life a fair inheritance in society, and realize the law of brotherhood in all relations.

6. That the prayer of the Kingdom includes necessary food for all people, reconciliation and fellowship among men, the removal of such things as are temptation to any, the deliverance of man and society from such evils as crime, poverty, disease and misery.

7. That every life born into the world has its meaning and value, and place should be found for it and an inheritance should be guaranteed to it.

8. That every life in the nation has its just claim to share in the social heritage, and society should safeguard this right for everyone. This does not mean an equal division of the natural resources, but it does mean such an administration of the social estate as shall ensure every life the equities of a fitting education, adequate opportunities, and all the advantages of a full, worthy human life.

9. That we are satisfied with the existing social order in so far as it is just and brotherly and no farther, and seek therefore to study social conditions, to maintain a steady opposition to all injustice in the state, in industry, in national and international affairs, and to seek ever to establish justice in all the relations of society.

The idea of the Kingdom of God, therefore, is at once a challenge, a confession and a summons. It is the challenge of everything that is unjust and unbrotherly and contrary to the order that God wants to prevail. It is a confession that there is another order than that which now prevails, the order which God wills, an order of justice, liberty and brotherhood. And it is a summons to the men of good will to dedicate themselves to the task of making justice prevail and establishing the divine order of human society.

Is it not conceivable that if the New Church should adopt this platform as embodying the practical aspects of its message to the world, it would soon gain an increasing hearing that would enable it to lead mankind towards the realization of this ideal?

Turning again to the book before us, we feel obliged to

express certain unfavorable comments upon Professor Kent's work. The volume furnishes abundant evidence that its author has drunk deep of the poison of the "higher criticism" that bears the stamp "Made in Germany." This is further evidenced by the fact that the author is the compiler and translator of what he has called "The Historical Bible," each chapter of which "begins with a section of the Bible in a new translation based on the discoveries of modern scholarship and therefore omitting scribal duplications." In the book before us this attitude of mind is perhaps most clearly shown in what he has to say about the Book of Deuteronomy, which he tells us (pp. 87-89) is a priestly forgery, perpetrated in the time of the high priest Hilkiah, and perhaps with his connivance, and foisted upon the people through the unwitting instrumentality of King Josiah.

From what he has to say about Jesus, we infer that Professor Kent is a Unitarian; for all the terms he uses about Jesus imply that he views Him merely as a man, however remarkable a one. For instance, he says: "Crying social needs influenced Jesus to become a social teacher and leader" (p. 182), implying that He wouldn't have become such but for these needs; again, "Jesus evidently accepted the Old Testament teachings regarding" (p. 246), etc.; again, "the Second Isaiah's marvellous picture of the servant of Jehovah, who voluntarily and joyously gave himself to the service of humanity, made a profound impression upon Jesus. He evidently regarded it not as a messianic programme to be carried out in detail, but as the dramatic statement of an ultimate social principle" (p. 196).

As a translator our author shows an amazing tendency to present his readers with a remarkable amount of Whitmanesque verse, apparently having discovered many parts of the Bible to be in poetic form where it was never before suspected: for instance, on page 306 we find I Corinthians xiii printed Whitmanesquely; and on page 272, verses 28-32 of Matthew vi receive the same treatment. More-

over, he manifests unrestrained freedom in departing from the customary versions, thus displaying a linguistic conceit not altogether pleasant.

As the title of our next book shows, — "The Social Teachings of the Jewish Prophets," — President Bizzell's treatise does not attempt to cover so much ground as that of Professor Kent, the latter half of whose volume is devoted to the teachings of Jesus and His followers. While Professor Kent passes over some of the Jewish prophets without mentioning their teachings, President Bizzell takes each one of them up chronologically, places him before us in his historical setting, and makes clear to us the main principles of a social nature for which he stands. To one using the Bible as his main text-book, President Bizzell's book would be a more useful guide to the understanding of the social bearings of the various prophetic books as taken up seriatim; but if all the Old Testament prophetic books are to be studied topically, Professor Kent will render more assistance to the student. Another advantage to be found in Mr. Bizzell's treatise is that of a more reverential attitude towards the Sacred Scriptures; for he frankly says that the study in hand has nothing to do with the questions usually considered by the "higher criticism," and therefore he rarely refers to any of them, though he incidentally takes occasion to affirm that the evidence against the Mosaic authorship of at least the larger part of Deuteronomy is wholly inadequate. In his own words, his volume is merely "a modest contribution to a better understanding of the thought and motive of the Jewish prophet." He shows clearly enough that many of the social diseases of our own day were in existence in relatively milder form in Old Testament times, and that the invective of the prophets was mainly directed against the causes of the disorders. Each chapter ends with several topics suggested for further study, and a list of references for such further study. The book can be warmly recommended to all interested in the subject.

B. A. WHITEMORE.

THE PANGERMAN PLOT UNMASKED *

This is the most important book, in the writer's opinion, that has been published on the War. The reason for this opinion is, that the author fulfils the obligation assumed in the first sentence of his preface, where he says "The Pangerman Plot is the only cause of the War." Let us read further the startling assertion—not so startling now as it was before other writers, including President Wilson, had adopted it, doubtless helped by the revelations of this book—"It [the Pangerman Plot] is, in fact, the cause at once of its outbreak and of its prolongation till that victory of the Allies has been won which is indispensable to the liberty of the world." The book goes on to demonstrate this by a series of documents, precise, clear, and intelligible. Owing to its nature, therefore, the book is not interesting as a novel would be, or as a narration of exciting personal experiences at the front, or of the devastations of territories invaded. It is a thorough study of twenty years, presented in the plain style of political history, and needs an appreciative attitude of mind to make it interesting; then the facts and their correlation become startling and enlightening. The survey takes in the whole world, and shows the relation of the Pangerman Plot to it.

When the War began, Germany was eager to urge, as she had been educating her own people to believe for at least twenty years, that she had been driven into it by necessity of self-defence. And this necessity was her excuse for the invasion of Belgium, and for the increasing wrongs that she perpetrated, and for the "frightfulness" she introduced. In his last Message to Congress President Wilson declares all such assertions to be "wantonly false." André Chéradame gives the facts that sustain the President's declaration beyond the shadow of a doubt. He shows how the Kaiser, William II, from the time of his accession began to develop the Pangerman

* *The Pangerman Plot Unmasked*: Berlin's Formidable Peace-Trap of "The Drawn War." By André Chéradame; with an Introduction by the Earl of Cromer, O. M. With maps. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1917. 266 pp. 12mo. \$1.25 net.

plan of forming a great Central Empire reaching from Hamburg to the Persian Gulf, by means of which he could dominate, and in due time subjugate, Europe on one side and the East on the other; and then finally subjugate North and South America and the rest of the world. To this end the Kaiser from the beginning of his reign schemed to get control of Austria-Hungary and Turkey, with the intervening Balkan states. What the nature of that great Central Empire would be is shown by the following extract from a pamphlet employed as long ago as 1895 for propaganda among Germans by the *Alldeutscher Verband*, the most powerful of the Pangerman organizations fostered by the Kaiser in preparing the way for the development of his plot:

No doubt the newly constituted Empires will not be peopled merely by Germans; but Germans alone will govern; they alone will exercise political rights; they alone will serve in the army and in the navy; they alone will have the right to become land-owners; thus they will acquire the conviction that, as in the Middle Ages, the Germans are a people of rulers. However, they will condescend so far as to delegate inferior tasks to foreign subjects subservient to Germany. (*Grossdeutschland und Mitteleuropa um das Jahr 1950*; published by Thormann und Goetsch, Berlin, p. 48.)

That this subjugation of the world to German despotism was intended to finally reach the United States of America is shown by what Rear-Admiral von Goetzen, a friend of the Kaiser, said to Admiral Dewey at Manilla in 1898:

In about fifteen years my country will begin a great war. . . . Some months after we have done our business in Europe we shall take New York and probably Washington, and we shall keep them for a time. We do not intend to take any territory from you, but only to put your country in its proper place with reference to Germany. We shall extract one or two billions of dollars from New York and other towns. (Naval and Military Record, quoted by *L'Echo de Paris*, Sept. 24, 1915.)

Many of us here in America remember that little episode at Manilla Bay; and we remember that we were only amused by it at the time as a bit of bluster from a chagrined German fleet-commander who was ordered out of the way by Admiral Dewey when he attempted to interfere with the naval battle

then on. Much to confirm this has transpired lately, and been made public,—especially in Ambassador Gerard's book, "My Four Years in Germany."

M. Chéradame makes some enlightening disclosures regarding Germany's spy system throughout the world, including America. He tells of the operation of the German "Delbruck's Law" of July 22, 1913, Article 25 of which reads as follows:

If any person before acquiring nationality in a foreign State, shall have received the written permission of a competent authority of his native State to retain his nationality of that State, he shall not lose his nationality of the said native State. The German consul shall be consulted before granting the said permission. (P. 195.)

This opens the way for the deepest kind of duplicity and treachery; for under it a German may swear allegiance to another country in being naturalized, and by a secret arrangement with his native country may continue his allegiance to her, and retain for himself and his descendants all the rights of a German citizen, and all the protection of the German Empire. The United States, in common with other countries, probably now has many such disloyal citizens, who have been and still are enemy-spies systematically distributed. This makes it entirely possible for a German State to grow up within every other State, and develop powerful means of influence. An illustration of this fearful condition of internal intrigue seems to be at hand in Russia. And doubtless the whole world that Germany intends to devour is well filled with it.

So the murder of the Crown Prince of Austria-Hungary was made the occasion for beginning the War, but the cause of it was the Pangerman Plot which was then ripe for execution. The Treaty of Bukarest, signed August 10, 1913, had much to do with it; for it was adverse to Germany, and if allowed to be carried out would become an insurmountable barrier. Moreover, the peoples of Austria-Hungary were leaning away from Germany to the Entente Allies,—two-thirds of them at least were anti-German, and an increasing number now are earnestly praying for her defeat as the only

hope of their escape from her tentacles, which have drawn them into the War against their real friends, and keep them there (pp. 31-32). Added to this was the belief in the militaristic circles of Germany that the Entente Allies were severely handicapped by domestic troubles, and that they would never be less prepared for war than at that critical moment. So it was decided that the time had come to precipitate the War upon the world. Of course they hoped that Great Britain could be kept out of it; and they had not the remotest thought that the United States would be drawn into it.

By means of the War Germany has already succeeded in accomplishing her main purpose, namely, of forming the great Central Empire; for she has made vassals of Austria-Hungary, Turkey, and Bulgaria, and has subjugated Poland, Serbia, and Roumania, as well as Belgium, Alsace-Lorraine and parts of France and Italy. M. Chéradame warns the Entente against letting her stop here, and make peace on the basis of a "drawn war"; for that would be a complete victory in disguise, enabling her after recuperation to go on and complete with comparative ease the subjugation of the world by force of arms, as she has plotted to do.

In the leading article of the *Atlantic Monthly* for last June, M. Chéradame shows how Germany by means of this War has thus enlarged her empire from 73,000,000 to 176,000,000 people, 21,000,000 of whom are vassals, and 82,000,000 slaves. And in later numbers of the same periodical he has called attention to the fact that the War has cost Germany little, in comparison with what it has cost the Allies, because she has so largely met her expenses by pillaging other countries, enslaving their inhabitants, and exacting large amounts of labor from them at almost no cost.

It is thus shown to be the duty, as well as the only protection, of the Allies to break the backbone of this Pangerman Plot by freeing Austria-Hungary from its captors, the Military Rulers of Prussia, and if possible by freeing misguided Germany itself from them at the same time.

In conclusion we quote the following:

The origin as well as the object of the War make it therefore the most cruelly reactionary enterprise conceivable, . . . which, if successful, would put the modern world back into the Middle Ages in the most odious fashion. But this time it would be a mediæval state of things made immutable through the force of the most modern science, which would stop the clock of progress. The death-dealing electric current which runs in the metallic wires actually forming an impassable barrier between Belgium and Holland forms a perfect symbol of what the Pangerman prison would be for those who do not belong to the German nationality. (P. 70.)

H. CLINTON HAY.

A DYNAMIC THEORY OF EVOLUTION.*

THE term "evolution" ordinarily calls to mind such expressions as "the survival of the fittest" and "natural selection," hence that way of looking at things which dispenses with the idea of God and substitutes "chance" as the central idea. Equipped with this terminology, we are invited to picture the gradual development of things out of primordial elements whose activity is somehow self-operative. The great objection is that we seem unable to work out an idea of the vast process without a prior conception of life or power of some sort as the actuating principle behind all visible changes. Bergson tries to advance beyond this position by assuming an *élan vital*, or original impetus of life, which guided the world-process. The author of the present work takes radical exception to the prevailing views, dismisses as a dogma which scientists have accepted uncritically the idea that chance is the central consideration, and endeavors to push the problem further back by renewed emphasis on law and energy as the two great terms. He does not undertake to tell us what the world-energy is. He does not raise the mooted questions concerning the origin of mind. More closely narrowing the issues, he points the way beyond matter and form toward an energy

* *The Origin and Evolution of Life; on the Theory of Action, Reaction and Interaction of Energy.* By H. F. Osborn. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1917. 353 pp., 8vo., illus. \$3.00 net.

conception of the origin of life and of heredity, believing that the history of evolution may be re-written in terms of "invisible energy." The orderly development which we call evolution, with the appearances of new characteristics, is not, he believes, accounted for either by Darwin's assumption of natural selection operating by "chance" or by Bergson's theory of an "internal perfecting tendency." For his part, he is content for the moment to hold very closely to the chemical and biological study of life, its actions and reactions within the organism. Thus cautious, he does not venture to speculate, but merely suggests the direction in which we may look for light.

A treatise on evolution which ends with a result apparently so barren is from another point of view profoundly suggestive. In the light of a spiritual philosophy one would expect that all evolutionisms would fail which put "chance" into the foreground, and afford no real explanation of the new species and varieties which appear along the line of life. One would expect Bergson to fail, too, since he does not suggest an adequate basis for the original impetus of life. But to trace all evolution to a point where a prior and richer energy appears to be the last stage of naturalistic thought, is to prepare the way for spiritual re-interpretation. For a spiritual philosophy is nothing if not an idea of a dynamic Cause behind all matter and form.

Hitherto not enough has been made of Swedenborg's essentially dynamic conception of the whole world-process. So much interest has been bestowed upon the parcelling out of things in discrete degrees, as if fences existed between things and their causes, and so much thought has been given to the idea of correspondence as the principle of relation between things discrete, that enough heed has not been paid to that still greater idea, namely, the dynamic inflow without which things in their degrees and correspondence would not exist. Swedenborg's view of creation is essentially a dynamic conception. There is one great Dynamic without which creation could not proceed. It applies to things in their origin, their singleness, their use, and to every stage in their history.

There is no explanation of things in terms of matter and form simply. There is no mere self-operating evolution by means of chance. Through all things there is an eternal law, and the action and interaction by which all the phenomena of life proceed is by virtue of the one Dynamic within all processes, a Dynamic which gets its purposes accomplished despite the apparent separateness of things in space with its discreteness.

It does not follow that a writer of Professor Osborn's stamp would take interest in Swedenborg's view. But the reader of Swedenborg who has come to realize how strong is the emphasis put on dynamic considerations is eager to note any sign on the part of contemporary evolutionism to push matters back to energy as the efficient idea. Granted such energy as a postulate of science, we are apparently no better off than when with Bergson we assume the existence of Life and its original impetus. Yet we have advanced a stage beyond all customary evolutionisms if with Osborn we revert to that older way of thinking which dates back to Aristotle and which emphasizes the reign of law in the operations of an energy larger even than life itself (in the biological sense). We once more see plainly that biology, as well as chemistry, physics, and even psychology, must fail. The primordial energy of things is far more than any one of these sciences can tell us. There must be an energy sufficient to be the ground of all the phenomena which these sciences disclose. It must be behind all matter and all form, however we interpret these. Thus far at least have we travelled in a spiritual direction.

HORATIO W. DRESSER, PH.D.

THE ROTCH EDITION OF

The Worship and Love of God

DESCRIBING

- I. The Origin of the Earth, Paradise, and the Abode of Living Creatures; also the Birth, Infancy and Love of the First-born or Adam.
- II. The Marriage of the First-born or Adam; and, in connection with it, the Soul, the Intellectual Mind, the State of Integrity, and the Image of God.
- III. The Married Life of the First-born Pair.

By EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

A revised and completed translation (including the Third Part now first published and translated into English from the Latin manuscript of the author) by Alfred H. Stroh, A.M., and Frank Sewall, A.M., D.D.

It is a presentation in sublime poetic form of the philosophic doctrine of creation as given in Swedenborg's "Principia," but adds the entirely new description of the formation and birth of man, and also an epitome of the physiology and psychology of the works on the "Animal Kingdom."

It is a very engaging and fascinating introduction to Swedenborg's entire scientific and philosophic system.

300 pages, 5 x 7 1-4 inches, bound in cloth. Price, \$1.00, postpaid.

Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 BOWDOIN STREET
BOSTON, MASS.

New Standard Edition of Swedenborg

An accurate and scholarly translation of the Latin of the theological works of Emanuel Swedenborg, being the same as that of the Library Edition, which sells for double the price given below, which is intended to place these wonderful Writings within the reach of all who may wish to have them on their shelves at home. Easily read Roman type, well printed on good paper and substantially bound in dark green cloth.

STANDARD EDITION	Postpaid
Arcana Coelestia, twelve volumes, each.....	\$0.60
Apocalypse Revealed, two volumes, each.....	.60
Heaven and Hell.....	.60
The True Christian Religion, two volumes, each	.60
Conjugal Love.....	.60
Divine Love and Wisdom.....	.60
Divine Providence.....	.60
The Four Doctrines.....	.60
Miscellaneous Theological Works.....	.60
Apocalypse Explained, six volumes, each.....	.60
Posthumous Theological Works, two volumes, each.....	.60

The American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society
Three West Twenty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.

THE
KINGDOM OF HEAVEN
AS SEEN BY
SWEDENBORG

By JOHN HOWARD SPALDING

"Ever since I became firmly convinced of the truth of Swedenborg's teaching, it has been my desire to present it in the simplest possible form; and this book is the result. . . . The aim . . . is to give a general idea of the main features of Swedenborg's teaching, so that a reader who wishes to go to the fountain-head for his information may have some outline of the system of thought propounded by him in his mind; into which he can fit the various particulars which he meets with in the course of his study. Swedenborg's works are often found difficult to understand because this kind of preparation has been neglected. . . .

"The mental attitude of one who has fully made up his mind with regard to any system of religious doctrine is apt, I think, to be rather unattractive to one who is still entangled in the mazes of doubt, for whose use especially this work is designed. "Ah!" he thinks, "this man has never felt *my* difficulties! It is all plain sailing to *him*." If this book has any value, it arises from the fact that the difficulties with which it deals are those through which the author himself had to fight his way during many years of study."

(From the Author's Introduction, page 5.)

348 pages, 12 mo. Cloth, \$1.50, postpaid

ORDER OF THE
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin Street, Boston, Mass.